



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्रधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० ५०]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, विसम्बर १२, १९८१/अग्राहायण २१, १९०३

No. 50]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1981/AGRAHAYANA 21, 1903

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड ३—उप-खण्ड (ii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांख्यिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

राष्ट्रपति सचिवालय

नई दिल्ली, ४ नवम्बर, १९८१

PRESIDENT'S SECRETARIAT

New Delhi, the 4th November, 1981

क्रा० आ० ३३३४—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेवज्जी) अधिनियम, १९७१ (१९७१ का ४०) की धारा ३ द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, नीचे सारणी के स्तम्भ (१) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (२) की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थानों के प्रवर्गों के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या उसके अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग और उन पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारी पदनाम	सरकारी स्थानों के प्रवर्ग
1	2
प्रवर सचिव राष्ट्रपति सचिवालय, नई दिल्ली।	स्थानों में नई दिल्ली, शिमला (हि० प्र०) में राष्ट्रपति की संपदा और राष्ट्रपति निलयम बोलायम (आ० प्र०) समाविष्ट हैं।

[क्रा० सं० ए० ११०१७/१/७९-ए०सी०एम०]
पी० इ० मेनन, मेजर जनरल
राष्ट्रपति के सैन्य सचिव।

TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of Public Premises
(1)	(2)
Under Secretary, President's Secretariat, New Delhi.	Premises comprising the President's Estate in New Delhi, Simla (H.P.) and Rashtrapati Nilayam, Bolan (A.P.)

[File No. A-11017/1/79-Acm]
P.E. MENON,
Maj. Gen.
Military Secretary to the President

गृह मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर, 1981

का० आ० 3335.—भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 11 अप्रैल, 1981 के पृष्ठ 1082 से 1098 तक पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय, कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1134, तारीख 23 मार्च, 1981 में,—

- (1) पृष्ठ 1088 पर, नियम 26 के उपनियम (4) में, "मुख्य प्रशासनिक प्राधिकारी" के स्थान पर "मुख्य प्रशासनिक चिकित्सा प्राधिकारी" पढ़ें ;
- (2) पृष्ठ 1090 पर, नियम 30 के उपनियम (2) (क) में, "नियम 6" के स्थान पर "नियम 6 का उपनियम (1)" पढ़ें ;
- (3) पृष्ठ 1091 पर, नियम 31 के उपनियम (2) में, "प्ररूप 4" के स्थान पर "प्ररूप 3" पढ़ें ;
- (4) पृष्ठ 1092 पर, प्ररूप 2 के अन्त में "केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संशोधन) नियम 1981" के स्थान पर "केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संशोधन) नियम, 1981" पढ़ें ;
- (5) पृष्ठ 1094 पर, प्ररूप 3 के पैरा 1 के खंड (ग) में, अंतिम पंक्ति में "विवरण की रिपोर्ट" के स्थान पर "विवरण या रिपोर्ट" पढ़ें ;
- (6) पृष्ठ 1097 पर, स्तंभ 2 में, "14 61" के स्थान पर, "14 64" पढ़ें ।

[संख्या 31(4)/81-पेंशन एकक]
के० एम० महादेवन, अवसर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)****CORRIGENDUM**

New Delhi, the 27th November, 1981

S.O. 3335.—In the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms No. S.O. 1134, dated the 23rd March, 1981, published at pages 1098 to 1109 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 11th April, 1981,—

- (1) at page 1099, in rule 6, in clause (a) of the proviso to sub-rule (1), for "this" read "his" ;
- (2) at page 1101, in clause (iii) of rule 18, for "scale" read "rule" ;
- (3) at page 1102, in sub-rule (4) of rule 26, for "The Chief Administrative Authority" read "The Chief Administrative Medical Authority" ;
- (4) at page 1104,—
 - (i) in sub-rule (2) of rule 30, for "rule 6" read "sub-rule (1) of rule 6" ;
 - (ii) in sub-rule (2) of rule 31, for "Form 4" read "Form 3" ;
- (5) at page 1105, in Form 2 in the opening paragraph, for "1980" read "1981" ;
- (6) at page 1106, in Form 3, in clause (c) of paragraph 1, for "Report of" read "Report or" ;
- (7) at page 1108, in the Table,—
 - (i) in the heading, for "per mensem" read "per annum" ;
 - (ii) in column 2, for "14.61" read "14.64".

[No. 31(4)/81-Pension Unit]
K. S. MAHADEVAN, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 अक्टूबर, 1981

आयकर

का० आ० 3336.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड (44) के उप-खंड (iii) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के राजस्व विभाग की दिनांक 15 मई, 1981 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3958 (फा सं० 398/13/81-आ०क०म०क०) का अनिवार्य करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री सरन बिहारी को, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारी हैं, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत कर वसूली अधिकारी की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए अधिकृत करती है।

2. यह अधिसूचना श्री सरन बिहारी द्वारा कर वसूली अधिकारी के पद का कार्यभार ग्रहण करने की तारीख से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 4254/फा०म० 398/13/81-आ०क०म०क०]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE**(Department of Revenue)**

New Delhi, the 12th October, 1981

INCOME TAX

S.O. 3336.—In pursuance of sub-clause (iii) of clause (44) of section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of Notification of the Government of India in the Department of Revenue No. 3958 (F. No. 398/13/81-ITCC) dated 15-5-81, the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Saran Behari, being a gazetted Officer of the Central Government, to exercise the powers of a Tax Recovery Officer under the said Act.

2. This Notification shall come into force with effect from the date Shri Saran Behari takes over charge as Tax Recovery Officer.

[No. 4254/F. No. 398/13/81-ITB]

नई दिल्ली, 21 अक्टूबर, 1981

आयकर

का० आ० 3337.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 2 के खंड (438) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और उपर्युक्त विषय पर दिनांक 30 जुलाई, 1974 की अधिसूचना संख्या 691 (फा० सं० 404/220/74-आ०क०म०क०) का आंशिक संशोधन करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा आयकर आयुक्त (वसूली) बम्बई को कर वसूली आयुक्त की शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[संख्या 4269 (फा०म० 398/26/81-आ०क० (बजट))
आ० सी० हांडा, उप सचिव.

New Delhi, the 21st October, 1981

INCOME TAX

S.O. 3337.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (438) of Section 2 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification of Notification No. 691 (F. No. 404/220/74-ITCC) dated 30th July, 1974 on the subject, the Central Government hereby authorises the Commissioner of Income-tax (Recovery) Bombay to exercise the powers of Tax Recovery Commissioner.

[No. 4269/F. No. 398/26/81-IT(B)]
R. C. HANDA, Deputy Secy.

व्यय विभाग

(रक्षा प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 26 अक्टूबर, 1981

का० आ० 3338.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में वित्त मंत्रालय, व्यय विभाग (रक्षा प्रभाग) के रक्षा लेखा

विभाग के भिन्न-भिन्न कार्यालयों को जिसके कर्मचारीबन्ध ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है अधिसूचित करता है :—

क्रम संख्या	कार्यालयों के नाम
1.	कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक, दक्षिणी कमान, पुणे ।
2.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, अहमदाबाद ।
3.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (क), अहमदाबाद ।
4.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ख), अहमदाबाद ।
5.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (क) बल्लार ।
6.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (कोलकाता), बम्बई ।
7.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय आयुध डिपो कान्दीवली, बम्बई ।
8.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, बेलगाव ।
9.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, बेवलाली ।
10.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, जामनगर ।
11.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, केन्द्रीय शस्त्र फैक्ट्री बाहून डिपो, किरकी ।
12.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, नागपुर ।
13.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, पुनगाव ।
14.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, तलेगाव, वनावे, बम्बई ।
15.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, त्रिवेन्द्रम ।
16.	कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा, बम्बई ।
17.	कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा, सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा, किरकी ।
18.	कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा, सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा, जांघपुर ।
19.	कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा, सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा, पुणे ।
20.	कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी, नौसेना परियोजना, बम्बई ।
21.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, जयपुर ।
22.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, 6 फील्ड आयुध डिपो, जोधपुर ।
23.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, जोधपुर ।
24.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, किरकी क्षेत्र ।
25.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, 312 वर्कशॉप, किरकी ।
26.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, नर्मदाबाद ।
27.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (क), पुणे ।
28.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (ख), पुणे ।
29.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, पनजी ।
30.	कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक, पटना ।
31.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा अधिकारी, बीनापुर, फैट ।
32.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, बीनापुर फैट ।
33.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, बीनापुर ।
34.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी स्टोर डिपो, बीनापुर ।
35.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, रांची ।
36.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, रांची ।
37.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (परियोजना), रांची ।
38.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, रांची ।

39.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी स्टोर डिपो, नामकुन ।
40.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा अधिकारी, नामकुन ।
41.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा अधिकारी, रामगढ़ ।
42.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा अधिकारी, राणा ।
43.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर 507, सिग्नल टुकड़ी वायुसेना सिंगरली ।
44.	कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा अधिकारी, सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा, कलकत्ता ।
45.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, (परियोजना) कलकत्ता ।
46.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, हज्जपुर ।
47.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, बैरकपुर ।
48.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (परियोजना) बैरकपुर ।
49.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, पानागढ़ ।
50.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (परियोजना) (इन्विपेस्ट) पानागढ़ ।
51.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, छपरैल ।
52.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी स्टोर डिपो, हासीमारा ।
53.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, बीनागुड़ी ।
54.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी 383, मेना सेवा कोर, सप्लाई ।
55.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (परियोजना) इन्विपेस्ट गोपालपुर आन सी ।
56.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर 866, इंजीनियरिंग निर्माण ।
57.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (इन्विपेस्ट) मोता ।
58.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी स्टोर डिपो, धीमापुर ।
59.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर 868, इंजीनियरिंग निर्माण ।
60.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, मुख्यालय-47, सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
61.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार--42, सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
62.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार मुख्यालय--46, सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
63.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार-15, सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
64.	कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार (परियोजना) हीरक ।
65.	कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक (वेशन), इलाहाबाद ।
66.	कार्यालय, वेशन भुगतान अधिकारी, कलकत्ता ।
67.	कार्यालय, वेशन भुगतान अधिकारी, शोधियारपुर ।
68.	कार्यालय, वेशन भुगतान अधिकारी, सिवामी ।
69.	कार्यालय, वेशन भुगतान अधिकारी, जयपुर ।
70.	कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक वायुसेना, देहरादून ।
71.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) भावनपुर ।
72.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) हलबारा ।
73.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) (अ) बंछेगढ़ ।
74.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) (ब) बंछेगढ़ ।
75.	कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (वायुसेना) (स) बंछेगढ़ ।

76. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (वायुसेना) अम्बाला ।
77. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा उपनिर्वाहक, (वायुसेना), नई दिल्ली ।
78. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) (अ), नई दिल्ली ।
79. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) (ब), नई दिल्ली ।
80. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) (म), नई दिल्ली ।
81. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) पालम, नई दिल्ली ।
82. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) रजोकरी ।
83. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) भागुरा ।
84. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) जोधपुर ।
85. कार्यालय सहायक अधीक्षक/स्थानीय, लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) खान्देली ।
86. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) बरेली ।
87. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ए) कानपुर ।
88. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा अधिकारी परीक्षा (ब) कानपुर ।
89. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) कानपुर ।
90. कार्यालय, सहायक अधीक्षक लेखा परीक्षा, (वायुसेना) कानपुर ।
91. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) बमरोली ।
92. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) मन्दीरी ।
93. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) नागपुर ।
94. कार्यालय, सहायक अधीक्षक स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) लखनऊ ।
95. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) गोरखपुर ।
96. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) (ब) शिलांग ।
97. कार्यालय, सहायक अधीक्षक लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) बन्नाईकुड ।
98. कार्यालय, सहायक अधीक्षक लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) पठानकोट ।
99. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) जामनगर ।
100. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) पूना ।
101. कार्यालय, सहायक अधीक्षक, लेखा परीक्षा (वायुसेना) पूना ।
102. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) धवलासी ।
103. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा उपनिर्वाहक (वायुसेना), बंगलूर ।
104. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) कौरा पुट ।
105. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी (वायुसेना) नासिक ।
106. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी, (वायुसेना) हैदराबाद ।
107. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा निर्वहक (अफसर) गोलीबार मैदान, पुणे ।
108. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा निर्वहक (नौसेना) बम्बई ।
109. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय परीक्षा अधिकारी (क) बम्बई ।
110. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ख) बम्बई ।
111. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ग) बम्बई ।
112. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (घ) बम्बई ।
113. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (क) विभागा-पस्तनम ।
114. कार्यालय क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, कोचीन ।
115. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (क) कोचीन ।
116. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, अमरावती ।
117. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (कैन्टीन भण्डार डिपो), दिल्ली ।
118. कार्यालय, नौसेना स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (कैन्टीन भण्डार डिपो) ऊधमपुर ।
119. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा, निर्वहक, पञ्चमी कमान, मेरठ ।
120. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ग) अम्बाला कैंट ।
121. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (बी) अम्बाला कैंट ।
122. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा) अम्बाला ।
123. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (नार्थ) अम्बाला ।
124. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (वायुसेना) अम्बाला ।
125. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (घाउथ) अम्बाला ।
126. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (इंजीनियरपार्क) अम्बाला ।
127. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, अम्बाला ।
128. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ग) अमृतसर ।
129. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, अमृतसर ।
130. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, गुलामपुर ।
131. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधीक्षक, गुरदासपुर ।
132. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (ए) फिरोजपुर ।
133. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (बी) फिरोजपुर ।
134. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (सी) फिरोजपुर ।
135. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (ईस्ट) फिरोजपुर ।
136. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (वेस्ट) फिरोजपुर ।
137. कार्यालय स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधीक्षक (आर्मी) कसौली ।
138. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, कसौली ।
139. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (पे) चंडीगढ़ ।
140. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (स्टोर कन्ट्रोल) चंडीगढ़ ।
141. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (आर्मी) चंडीगढ़ ।
142. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा) चंडीगढ़ ।
143. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, चंडीगढ़ ।
144. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (वायुसेना) चंडीगढ़ ।
145. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर, चंडी मन्दिर, चंडीगढ़ ।
146. कार्यालय यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी (वायुसेना), चंडीगढ़ ।
147. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी (राजस्व), चंडीगढ़ ।
148. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, चंडी मन्दिर, चंडीगढ़ ।
149. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा अधिकारी (सैन्य इंजीनियर सेवा) जालन्धर ।
150. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (सी) जालन्धर ।
151. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (ईस्ट) जालन्धर ।
152. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (वेस्ट) जालन्धर ।
153. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इंजीनियर (इंजीनियर पार्क) जालन्धर ।
154. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, गैरिजन इंजीनियर (ईस्ट) जालन्धर ।
155. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर अधिकारी, गैरिजन इंजीनियर (वेस्ट) जालन्धर ।
156. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (वेजन) जालन्धर ।
157. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी 223 प्रशस्ति आयुध बेन डिपो, सुरातमी ।

158. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, ब्राह्मपुर ।
159. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (शिमला) ।
160. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार स्टेशन, हूड बर्गटर्, शिमला ।
161. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, जहोज शिमला ।
162. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ए) पटियाला ।
163. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, पटियाला ।
164. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, हलवाग ।
165. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ए) मृधियाना ।
166. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी परियोजना, बेतक ।
167. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा, अधिकारी (ए) बीकानेर ।
168. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, बीकानेर ।
169. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर परियोजना, त्रिसार ।
170. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, फरीदकोट ।
171. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, फरीदकोट ।
172. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, भटिण्डा ।
173. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, भटिण्डा ।
174. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार, 573 इजीनियर स्टोर पार्क ।
175. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर परियोजना-3
176. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार, 881 इजीनियर निर्माण
177. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार, 5883 श्री गंगानगर ।
178. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर (बाहल) मिरसा ।
179. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, भूरनगढ़ ।
180. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, श्री गंगानगर ।
181. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, घामों ह्रेड बर्गटर्, दिल्ली ।
182. कार्यालय, बेतक और लेखा अधिकारी (अन्य बैंक) राष्ट्रपति भवन, दिल्ली ।
183. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार मुख्य प्रशासनिक अधिकारी, दिल्ली ।
184. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार (बायुमेन) स्टेशन, दिल्ली ।
185. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार सेना मुख्यालय, दिल्ली ।
186. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, वैदिक निर्गम डिपो, दिल्ली ।
187. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, लालकिला, दिल्ली ।
188. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैंक स्टोर अधिकारी, लालकिला, दिल्ली ।
189. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (आयुध डिपो) शाकूरबस्ता ।
190. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (ए) दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
191. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (बी) दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
192. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी केन्द्रीय वाहन डिपो, दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
193. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (मण्डल सेना चिकित्सा भण्डार डिपो) ।
194. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी (स्टोर) केन्द्रीय आयुध डिपो, दिल्ली ।
195. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, 505 घामों बकशाप, दिल्ली ।
196. कार्यालय, क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी, (सैन्य इजीनियर सेवा), दिल्ली ।
197. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर (ईस्ट) दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
198. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर (वेस्ट) दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
199. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर परियोजना न० 3, दिल्ली ।
200. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर विद्युत एवं यांत्रिकी, दिल्ली ।
201. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी परियोजना, दीपक ।
202. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी 45 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
203. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 68, सड़क निर्माण कम्पनी ।
204. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 65, सड़क निर्माण कम्पनी ।
205. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 67, सड़क निर्माण कम्पनी ।
206. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 21 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल/द्वारा 56 सेना डाकघर ।
207. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 49 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल/द्वारा 58 सेना डाकघर ।
208. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार, 1329, बेर डिपो ।
209. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 70, सड़क निर्माण कम्पनी ।
210. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 38, सीमा सड़क कार्य बल ।
211. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा अधिकारी इजीनियर स्टोर डिपो, दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
212. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैंक स्टोर अधिकारी (पूर्व), दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
213. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर, (उत्तर), पालम, दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
214. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैंक स्टोर अधिकारी (पश्चिम) दिल्ली ।
215. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर पालम, बक्षिण ।
216. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार गैरिजन इजीनियर (परियोजना) तुंगसकाबाव ।
217. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैंक स्टोर अधिकारी, उत्तर ।
218. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार स्टेशन, हिन्डन ।
219. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार (परियोजना) 2, टिगरिम रोड ।
220. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार वायु सुरक्षा स्थानीय पर्यवेक्षण प्रणाली, दिल्ली ।
221. कार्यालय, यूनिट क्षेत्रीय लेखा, दिल्ली ।
222. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा संयुक्त नियंत्रक (निधि) मेरठ ।
223. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक (अन्य बैंक) मेरठ ।
224. लब्धाख लेखा कार्यालय, लेह ।
225. जम्मू-काश्मीर लाईट इन्फैन्ट्री, श्रीनगर ।
226. कार्यालय, 14 गोरखा टोर्गन सेंटर, मुवाथु ।
227. कार्यालय, बंगाल इजीनियर ग्रुप, रुडकी ।
228. कार्यालय, राजपूताना राइफल रेजीमेन्ट सेंटर, दिल्ली कैप्ट ।
229. कार्यालय, ग्रन्थ पशु चिकित्सा कोर, मेरठ ।
230. कार्यालय, गोरखा राइफल लेग हाउन ।
231. कार्यालय, सिक्ख लाईट इन्फैन्ट्री, फतेहगढ़ ।
232. कार्यालय, राजपूत रेजीमेन्ट सेंटर, फतेहगढ़ ।
233. कार्यालय, कुमाऊ रेजीमेन्ट सेंटर, रानीखेत ।
234. कार्यालय, सेना चिकित्सा कोर, लखनऊ ।

235. कार्यालय, इंगेरा रेजीमेन्टल सेन्टर, फैजाबाद ।
236. कार्यालय, 39 गोरखा ट्रेनिंग सेंटर, बाराणसी ।
237. कार्यालय, जाट रेजीमेन्ट सेन्टर, बरेली ।
238. कार्यालय, पंजाब रेजीमेन्ट सेन्टर, रामगढ़ ।
239. कार्यालय, मिक्ख रेजीमेन्ट सेन्टर, रामगढ़ ।
[लिखा नियंत्रक (फकट्री) कानपुर] ।
240. लेखा कार्यालय, राइफल फैक्ट्री, ईलापुर ।
241. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, कानपुर ।
242. लेखा कार्यालय स्माल आर्म फैक्ट्री, कानपुर ।
243. लेखा कार्यालय आयुध फैक्ट्री, कानपुर ।
244. लेखा कार्यालय आयुध पैग फैक्ट्री, कानपुर ।
245. लेखा कार्यालय फील्ड गन फैक्ट्री, कानपुर ।
246. लेखा कार्यालय आयुध कमीडिंग फैक्ट्री, शाहजहाँपुर ।
247. लेखा कार्यालय आयुध फैक्ट्री, मुरादनगर ।
248. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, बेहलपुर ।
249. लेखा कार्यालय वाहन फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर ।
250. लेखा कार्यालय, ग्रे आयरन फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर ।
251. लेखा कार्यालय आयुध फैक्ट्री, घम्बाहारी ।
252. लेखा कार्यालय, गन एंड कैरिज फैक्ट्री, जबलपुर ।
253. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री खमरिया ।
254. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, कटनी ।
255. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, भुसावत ।
256. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, वारनगांव ।
257. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, भम्बरनाथ ।
258. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, भंडारा ।
259. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, चन्दा ।
260. लेखा कार्यालय, एम्प्लोशन फैक्ट्री, बिरकी ।
261. लेखा कार्यालय, आयुध फैक्ट्री, त्रिवेन्द्रपुर ।
262. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक, उत्तरी कमान, जम्मू ।
263. कार्यालय, रक्षा लेखा नियंत्रक, उत्तरी कमान, जम्मूखंड ।
264. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय (सेना) जम्मू ।
265. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय (सेना) उधमपुर ।
266. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय (क्षेत्रीय आयुध डिपो)
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
267. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय (सेना) श्रीनगर ।
268. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय, (सेना) पठानकोट ।
269. कार्यालय, स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय, धौल ।
270. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी (परियोजना) 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
271. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी (परियोजना) बीकन 36 सेना
पोस्ट आफिस ।
272. कार्यालय, अधीक्षक स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा 25 इन्फैन्ट्री बिबीजन
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
273. कार्यालय, अधीक्षक स्थानीय लेखा परीक्षा 360 कम्पनी सेना
पूति कॉर (पूति) 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
274. क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय, पठानकोट ।
275. क्षेत्रीय लेखा परीक्षा कार्यालय, श्रीनगर ।
276. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6362 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
277. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर 6362 इंजीनियरी निर्माण
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
278. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 862, 56 सेना पोस्ट
आफिस ।
279. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 865 इंजीनियरी निर्माण
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
280. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग 873 इंजीनियरी निर्माण
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
281. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 969 इंजीनियरी निर्माण
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
282. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 970 इंजीनियरी निर्माण
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
283. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6351 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
284. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6352 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
285. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6354 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
286. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6355 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
287. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6356 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
288. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6357 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
289. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6358 इंजीनियरी
निर्माण 56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
290. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 571 इंजीनियरी पार्क
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
291. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 574 इंजीनियरी पार्क
56 सेना पोस्ट आफिस ।
292. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी (परियोजना) आयुध सेना
धामोवर-करवा ।
293. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी (कान्हा हिल) योग ।
294. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार बैरक स्टोर योग ।
295. कार्यालय यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6360, 56 सेना पोस्ट
आफिस ।
296. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी 6361, 56 सेना
पोस्ट आफिस ।
297. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 13 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल, 56 सेना
पोस्ट आफिस ।
298. कार्यालय, लेखा अधिकारी 16 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल, 56 सेना
पोस्ट आफिस ।
299. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 31 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल, 56 सेना
पोस्ट आफिस ।
300. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 35 सीमा सड़क कार्य बल, 56 सेना
डाकघर ।
301. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार 1326, बेस डिपो 36, सेना पोस्ट
आफिस ।
302. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार पश्चिमी बेस कार्यशास्त्र, पठानकोट ।
303. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार स्टोर प्रभाग, पठानकोट ।
304. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार दुर्ग इंजीनियरी नं० 2 कालुचक ।
305. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार महायक दुर्ग इंजीनियरी (स्वतंत्र)
सांवा ।
306. कार्यालय, यूनिट लेखाकार सहायक दुर्ग इंजीनियरी, डलहौजी ।

[मं० ई० 11011/1/81-हिन्दी]

गुरु प्रसाद शर्मा, उप वित्तीय सलाहकार (स्थापना)

(Department of Expenditure)

(Defence Division)

New Delhi, the 26th October, 1981

S.O. 3338.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976 the Central Government hereby notifies the following Offices of the Defence Accounts Department of the Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure, Defence Division staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :—

- | Sl. No. | Name of Offices |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Southern Command, Pune. |
| 2. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Ahmednagar. |
| 3. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (A), Ahmedabad. |
| 4. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (B), Ahmedabad. |
| 5. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (A), Alwar. |
| 6. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Kolaba, Bombay. |
| 7. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Central Ordnance Depot, Kandiwali, Bombay. |
| 8. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Balgaon. |
| 9. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Devlali. |
| 10. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Jamnagar. |
| 11. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Central Armament Factory Vehicle Depot, Kirkee. |
| 12. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Nagpur. |
| 13. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Pulgaon. |
| 14. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Talegaon Dawade. |
| 15. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Trivendrum. |
| 16. | Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Military Engineer Service, Bombay. |
| 17. | Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Military Engineer Service, Kirkee. |
| 18. | Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Military Engineer Service, Jodhpur. |
| 19. | Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Military Engineer Service, Pune. |
| 20. | Office of the Accounts Officer, Naval Project, Bombay. |
| 21. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Jaipur. |
| 22. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, 6 Field Ordnance Depot, Jodhpur. |
| 23. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Jodhpur. |
| 24. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Kirkee Region. |
| 25. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, 512 Workshop, Kirkee. |
| 26. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Naseerabad. |
| 27. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (A), Pune. |
| 28. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (B), Pune. |
| 29. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Panaji. |
| 30. | Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Patna. |
| 31. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Dinapur Cantt. |
| 32. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Dinapur Cantt. |
| 33. | Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer, Dinapur. |
| 34. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit, Store Depot, Dinapur. |
| 35. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Ranchi. |
| 36. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Ranchi. |
| 37. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project), Ranchi. |
| 38. | Office of the Unit Accountant Barracks Store Officer, Ranchi. |
| 39. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Store Depot, Namkun. |
| 40. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit, Namkun. |
| 41. | Office of the Local Audit Officer, Ramgarh. |
| 42. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit, Gaya. |
| 43. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, 507 Signal Unit Air Force, Singarasi. |
| 44. | Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Military Engineer Service, Calcutta. |
| 45. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project), Calcutta. |
| 46. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Ishapur. |
| 47. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Barrackpur. |
| 48. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project), Barrackpur. |
| 49. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Panagarh. |
| 50. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project) (Independent), Panagarh. |
| 51. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Khaprail. |
| 52. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Store Depot, Hasimara. |
| 53. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Binagudi. |
| 54. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit, 383 Army Service Core Supplies. |
| 55. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project), (Independent), Gopalpur On C. |
| 56. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 866, Engineering Works. |
| 57. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Air Force) (Independent), Meesa. |
| 58. | Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Store Depot, Deemapur. |
| 59. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 868, Engineering Works. |
| 60. | Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Head Quarters-47 Boarder Road, Task Force. |
| 61. | Office of the Unit Accountant, 42 Boarder Road Task Force. |
| 62. | Office of the Unit Accountant Hqrs., 46 Boarder Road, Task Force. |
| 63. | Office of the Unit Accountant, 15, Boarder Road, Task Force. |
| 64. | Office of the Accountant Officer (Project), Heerk. |
| 65. | Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts (Pension), Allahabad. |
| 66. | Office of the Pension Pay Master, Calcutta. |
| 67. | Office of the Pension Pay Master, Hoshiarpur. |
| 68. | Office of the Pension Pay Master, Bhiwani. |
| 69. | Office of the Pension Pay Master, Jaipur. |
| 70. | Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts (Air Force), Dehradun. |
| 71. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Adampur. |
| 72. | Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Halwara. |

73. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) (A), Chandigarh.
74. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) (B), Chandigarh.
75. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) (C), Chandigarh.
76. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Ambala.
77. Office of the Deputy Controller of Defence Accounts (Air Force), New Delhi.
78. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force "A", New Delhi.
79. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) "B", New Delhi.
80. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) "C", New Delhi.
81. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) Palam, New Delhi.
82. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Rajokari.
83. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Aayara.
84. Office of the Local Officer (Air Force), Jodhpur.
85. Office of the Assistant Superintendent General Audit (Air Force), Gwalior.
86. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Bareilly.
87. Office of the Local Audit Officer "A", Kanpur.
88. Office of the Local Audit Officer "B", Kanpur.
89. Office of the Accounts Officer (Air Force), Kanpur.
90. Office of the Assistant Superintendent Local Audit (Air Force), Kanpur.
91. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Bamroli.
92. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Manauri.
93. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) Nagpur.
94. Office of the Assistant Superintendent Local Audit (Air Force), Lucknow.
95. Office of the Local Officer (Air Force), Gorkhpur.
96. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force) "B" Shillong.
97. Office of the Assistant Superintendent Audit (Air Force), Kalikunda.
98. Office of the Assistant Superintendent Audit (Air Force), Pathankot.
99. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Jamnagar.
100. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Pune.
101. Office of the Assistant Superintendent Audit (Air Force), Pune.
102. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Air Force), Devlali.
103. Office of the Deputy Controller of Defence Accounts (Air Force), Bangalore.
104. Office of the Accounts Officer (Air Force), Koraput.
105. Office of the Accounts Officer (Air Force), Nasik.
106. Office of the Accounts Officer (Air Force), Hyderabad.
107. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts (Officer) Artillery Field, Pune.
108. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts (Navy), Bombay.
109. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "A", Bombay.
110. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "B", Bombay.
111. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "C", Bombay.
112. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "D", Bombay.
113. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "A" Vishakhapatnam.
114. Office of the Regional Audit Officer, Cochin.
115. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer "A", Cochin.
116. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer, Asvaye.
117. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer (Canteen Store Depot), Delhi.
118. Office of the Naval Local Audit Officer, (Canteen Store Depot), Solampur.
119. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Western Command, Meerut.
120. Office of the Local Audit Officer "A", Ambala Cantt.
121. Office of the Local Audit Officer "B", Ambala Cantt.
122. Office of the Regional Audit Officer (Military-Engineer Service), Ambala.
123. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (North), Ambala.
124. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Air Force), Ambala.
125. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (South), Ambala.
126. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Engineer Park), Ambala.
127. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer, Ambala.
128. Office of the Local Audit Officer (A), Amritsar.
129. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Amritsar.
130. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Gurdaspur.
131. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit, Gurdaspur.
132. Office of the Local Audit Officer 'A', Ferozpur.
133. Office of the Local Audit Officer 'B', Ferozpur.
134. Office of the Local Audit Officer 'C', Ferozpur.
135. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (East), Ferozpur.
136. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (West), Ferozpur.
137. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit (Army), Kasauli.
138. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Kasauli.
139. Office of the Area Accounts Officer (Pay), Chandigarh.
140. Office of the Area Accounts Officer (Store Contract), Chandigarh.
141. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Army), Chandigarh.
142. Office of the Regional Audit Officer (Military-Engineer Service), Chandigarh.
143. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Chandigarh.
144. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Air Force), Chandigarh.
145. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Candi Mandi.
146. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer (Revenue), Chandigarh.
147. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer (Revenue) Chandigarh.
148. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer, Chandi Mandi.
149. Office of the Regional Audit Officer (Military-Engineer Service), Jullundur.
150. Office of the Local Audit Officer (C), Jullundur.

151. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (East) Jullundur.
152. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (West) Jullundur.
153. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Engineer Park) Jullundur.
154. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer Garrison Engineer (East) Jullundur.
155. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer Garrison Engineer (West) Jullundur.
156. Office of the Area Accounts Officer (Pension) Jullundur.
157. Office of the Local Audit Officer 223, Ammunition Base Ordnance Depot, Sooranusi.
158. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Adampur.
159. Office of the Local Audit Officer, (Simla).
160. Office of the Unit Accountant Station Headquarter Simla.
161. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Jahaz, Simla.
162. Office of the Local Audit Officer (A) Patiala.
163. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Patiala.
164. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Halwara.
165. Office of the Local Audit Officer (A) Ludhlana.
166. Office of the Local Audit Officer, Project Chetol.
167. Office of the Local Audit Officer (A) Bikaner.
168. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Bikaner.
169. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Project, Hissar.
170. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Faridkot.
171. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Faridkot.
172. Office of the Local Audit Officer, Bhatinda.
173. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Bhatinda.
174. Office of the Unit Accountant--573 Engineer Store Park.
175. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Project-III.
176. Office of the Unit Accountant 881 Engineering Works.
177. Office of the Unit Accountant 883 Shri Ganga Nagar.
178. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Vehicle, Sirsa.
179. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, Suratgarh.
180. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Shri Ganga Nagar.
181. Office of the Local Audit, Army Headquarter, Delhi.
182. Office of the Pay and Accounts Officer (Other Ranks) President Bodyguard, Delhi.
183. Office of the Unit Accountant Chief Administrative Office, Delhi.
184. Office of the Unit Accountant (Air Force) Stadium Delhi.
185. Office of the Unit Accountant Army Headquarters, Delhi.
186. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Daily Issue Depot, Delhi.
187. Office of the Local Audit Officer Red Fort, Delhi.
188. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer Red Fort, Delhi.
189. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Ordnance Depot) Shakurbasti.
190. Office of the Local Audit Officer (A) Delhi Cantt.
191. Office of the Local Audit Officer (B) Delhi Cantt.
192. Office of the Local Audit Officer Central Vehicle Depot, Delhi Cantt.
193. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit (Armed Forces Medical Store Depot).
194. Office of the Local Audit Officer (Store) Central Ordnance Depot, Delhi.
195. Office of the Local Audit Officer 505 Army Workshop, Delhi.
196. Office of the Regional Audit Officer (Military Engineer Service) Delhi.
197. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (East) Delhi Cantt.
198. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (West) Delhi Cantt.
199. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Project No. 3, Delhi.
200. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer Electrical and Mechanical, Delhi.
201. Office of the Accounts Officer Project, Deepak.
202. Office of the Accounts Officer 45 Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
203. Office of the Unit Accountant 68, Road Construction Company.
204. Office of the Unit Accountant 65, Road Construction Company.
205. Office of the Unit Accountant 67, Road Construction Company.
206. Office of the Unit Accountant 21, Boarder Road, Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
207. Office of the Unit Accountant 49 Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
208. Office of the Unit Accountant 1329 Base Depot.
209. Office of the Unit Accountant 70 Road Construction Company.
210. Office of the Unit Accountant 38 Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
211. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit Engineer Store Depot, Delhi Cantt.
212. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer (East) Delhi Cantt.
213. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer, (North) Palam, Delhi Cantt.
214. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer (West) Delhi.
215. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (South) Palam.
216. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project) Tuglakabad.
217. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Officer North.
218. Office of the Unit Accountant Station, Hindon.
219. Office of the Unit Accountant (Project) 2 Tigris Road.
220. Office of the Unit Accountant Air Defence Ground Environment System Delhi.
221. Area Accounts Office Delhi.
222. Office of the Joint Controller of Defence Accounts (Funds) Meerut.
223. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts (Other Ranks) Meerut.
224. Ladakh Accounts Office, Leh.
225. Jammu and Kashmir Light Infantry, Srinagar.
226. Office of the 14 Gorkha Training Centre, Subathu.

227. Office of the Bengal Engineer Group Rurkee.
228. Office of the Rajputana Rifles Regimental Centre Delhi Cantt.
229. Office of the Remount Veterinary Corps. Meerut.
230. Office of the Gorkha Rifles Lance Down.
231. Office of the Sikh Light Infantry Fatehgarh.
232. Office of the Rajput Regiment Centre Fatehgarh.
233. Office of the Humayun Regimental Centre, Ranikhet.
234. Office of the Army Medical Corps Lucknow.
235. Office of the Dogra Regimental Centre, Ferozabad.
236. Office of the 39 Gorkha Training Center, Varanasi.
237. Office of the Jat Regiment Centre, Bareilly.
238. Office of the Punjab Regiment Centre, Ramgarh.
239. Office of the Sikh Regiment Centre, Ramgarh. (Accounts Controller (Factory) Calcutta).
240. Accounts Office, Rifles Factory, Ishapur.
241. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Kanpur.
242. Accounts Office small Arms Factory, Kanpur.
243. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Kanpur.
244. Accounts Office Ordnance Para Factory, Kanpur.
245. Accounts Office Field Gun Factory, Kanpur.
246. Accounts Office Ordnance Clothing Factory, Shah-jahanpur.
247. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Muradnagar.
248. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Dehradun.
249. Accounts Office Vehicle Factory, Jabalpur.
250. Accounts Office Grey Iron Factory, Jabalpur.
251. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Ambajhari.
252. Accounts Office Gun and Carriage Factory, Jabalpur.
253. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory Khamaria.
254. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Katni.
255. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Bhusawal.
256. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Barguaon.
257. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Ambarnath.
258. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Bhandara.
259. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Chanda.
260. Accounts Office Ammunition Factory, Kirkee.
261. Accounts Office Ordnance Factory, Trichirapalli.
262. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Northern Command, Jammu.
263. Office of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Northern Command, Jullundur.
264. Local Audit Office (Army) Jammu.
265. Local Audit Office (Army) Udhampur.
266. Local Audit Office (Field Ordnance Depot) 56 Army, Post Office.
267. Local Audit Office (Army) Srinagar.
268. Local Audit Office (Army) Pathankot.
269. Local Audit Office, Yal.
270. Office of the Accounts Officer (Project) 56 Army Post Office.
271. Office of the Accounts Officer (Project) Beekan, 56 Army Post Office.
272. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit 25 Infantry Division 56 Army Post Office.
273. Office of the Superintendent Local Audit 360 Company Army Supply Core (Supply) 56 Army Post Office.
274. Regional Audit Office Pathankot.
275. Regional Audit Office Srinagar.
276. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6362 Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
277. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store 6362 Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
278. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 862, 56 Army Post Office.
279. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 865 Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
280. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 873 Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
281. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 969, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
282. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 970, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
283. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6351, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
284. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6352, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
285. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6354, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
286. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6355, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
287. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6356, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
288. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6357, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
289. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6358, Engineering Works 56 Army Post Office.
290. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 571, Engineer Park, 56 Army Post Office.
291. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 574, Engineer Park, 56 Army Post Office.
292. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Project) Air Force, Damodar Karva.
293. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer (Kandra Hill) Yal.
294. Office of the Unit Accountant Barrack Store Yal.
295. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6360, 56, Army Post Office.
296. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer 6361, 56, Army Post Office.
297. Office of the Unit Accountant, 13 Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
298. Office of the Accounts Officer 16, Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
299. Office of the Unit Accountant 31 Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
300. Office of the Unit Accountant 35, Boarder Road Task Force, 56 Army Post Office.
301. Office of the Unit Accountant 1326 Base Depot 56, Army Post Office.
302. Office of the Unit Accountant Western Base Workshop Pathankot.
303. Office of the Unit Accountant Store Division Pathankot.
304. Office of the Unit Accountant Garrison Engineer No. 2, Kaluchak.
305. Office of the Unit Accountant Assistant Garrison Engineer (Independent) Samba.
306. Office of the Unit Accountant Assistant Garrison Engineer, Dalhousi.

[No. E-11011/1/81-Hind]

G. P. CHADHA, Dy. Financial Adviser (E)

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1981

क्र.सं. 3339.—औद्योगिक वित्त निगम अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 15) की धारा 21 की उपधारा (2) के प्रवृत्तियों में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय औद्योगिक वित्त निगम के निदेशक मण्डल की सिफारिश पर, उक्त निगम द्वारा 4 दिसम्बर, 1981 को जारी किये जाने वाले और 4 दिसम्बर, 1986 को परिपक्व होने वाले बांडों पर की जाने वाली व्याज की दर, एतद्वारा, 7-1/4 (सब सात प्रतिशत) वार्षिक निर्धारित करती है।

[संख्या एक 2(27)/आई.एफ. 1/81]
के. पी. पाण्डियन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3339.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of Section 21 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948 (15 of 1948), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India, hereby fixes 7 1/4 (Seven and one fourth per cent) per annum as the rate of interest payable on the bonds to be issued by the said Corporation on 4th December, 1981 and maturing on 4th December, 1986.

[No. 2(27)/IF. 1/81]
K. P. PANDIAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 26 नवम्बर, 1981

क्र.सं. 3340.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 1 मार्च, 1984 तक की अवधि के लिए नगर डिस्ट्रिक्ट को-ऑपरेटिव बैंक लि., अहमदनगर पर वहां तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका सम्बन्ध इस बैंक द्वारा अहमदनगर में कुछ और बैंकिंग प्राप्ति जिनका विवरण नीचे दिया गया है, की धारिता से है।

गैर बैंकिंग प्राप्तिवा

क्रम सं०	निम्नलिखित में	विवरण
1.	भिंगर कैम्प	मकान सं० 248 सर्वे सं० 213/264
2.	दुले चांदगांव	सर्वे सं० 15 वाली भूमि
3.	कोलगांव	सर्वे सं० 892, 961 और 1077 वाली भूमि

[संख्या 8(36)/81-ए.सी.]

New Delhi, the 26th November, 1981

S.O. 3340.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Nagar District Urban Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Ahmednagar in so far as they relate to its holding of certain non-banking assets as described below in Ahmednagar District for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 1 March, 1984.

Non-Banking Assets

Sr. No.	Held at	Description
1.	Bhingar Camp	House No. 248 Survey No. 213/264.
2.	Dule Chandgaon	Land bearing Survey No. 15.
3.	Kolgaon	Land bearing Survey Nos. 892, 961 and 1077.

[No. 8(36)/81-AC]

क्र.सं. 3341.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 के साथ पठित धारा 56 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से 30 जून, 1982 तक की अवधि के लिए डिस्ट्रिक्ट को-ऑपरेटिव सेन्ट्रल बैंक लि., बिदिशा (मध्य प्रदेश) पर वहां तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका सम्बन्ध इस बैंक द्वारा गैर-बैंकिंग प्राप्ति अर्थात् की धारिता से है।

क्र.सं. ग्राम*	भूमि के विवरण
1.	पोरुखेड़ी 4.505 हेक्टेयर
2.	कराखेड़ी 0.690 "
3.	कारोडिया बगड़ 0.904 "
4.	सिमरहार गांव 124.01 बीघा

[संख्या 8(40)/81-ए.सी.]

S.O. 3341.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the District Co-operative Central Bank Ltd., Vidisha, (M.P.) so far as they relate to its holding of a non-banking asset viz* for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 30 June, 1982.

*Villages	Particulars of land
1.	Porukhedi 4.505 hectares
2.	Karrakhedi 0.690 hectares
3.	Karaudia Bagad 0.904 hectares
4.	Simhar 124.01 hectares

[No 8 (40)/81-AC]

क्र.सं. 3342.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपबन्ध इस अधिसूचना के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से, 30 जून, 1982 तक की अवधि के लिए सत्यमंगलम् को-ऑपरेटिव अर्बन बैंक लि. पर वहां तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक इनका सम्बन्ध इस बैंक द्वारा गैर बैंकिंग प्राप्ति अर्थात् मलैयाडीपुडूर ग्राम, सत्यमंगलम् तालुका, कोडुमटूर जिला, तमिल नाडु में एच० एक० 284 की 0.66-2/3 एकड़ भूमि की धारिता से है।

[संख्या 8(41)/81-ए.सी.]

S.O. 3342.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Satyamangalam Co-operative Urban Bank Ltd., so far as they relate to its holding of a non-banking asset viz. 0.66-2/3 acre of land bearing SF 284 at Malaiyadipudur Village, Satyamangalam Taluka, Coimbatore District, Tamil Nadu for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 30-6-1982.

[No. 8(41)/81-AC]

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर, 1981

का.अं. 3343.—प्रादेशिक ग्रामीण बैंक अधिनियम, 1976 (1976 का 21) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा श्री सी.एन. शाह को बानस्कान्था मेहसना ग्रामीण बैंक पाटन का अध्यक्ष नियुक्त करती है तथा 29-11-1981 से प्रारम्भ होकर 28-11-1984 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को उस अवधि के रूप में निर्धारित करती है जिसके दौरान श्री सी.एन. शाह अध्यक्ष के रूप में कार्य करेंगे।

[संख्या एफ. 1-36/80-आर.अं.बी.]

दिनेश चन्द्र, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 27th November, 1981

S.O. 3343.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 (21 of 1976), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri C. N. Shah as the Chairman of the Banaskantha Meh-sana Gramin Bank, Patan and specifies the period commencing on the 29-11-1981 and ending with the 28-11-1984 as the period for which the said Shri C. N. Shah shall hold office as such Chairman.

[No. F. 1-36/80-RRB]
DINESH CHANDRA, Director**केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड**

सं. 267/81-सीमा शुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 12 दिसम्बर, 1981

का.अं. 3344.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड, सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1982 (1982 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, हरियाणा राज्य में पानीपत को भाण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करता है।

[फा. सं. 473/131/81-सीमा शुल्क-7]

आनन्द छाबड़ा, सचिव

CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1981

NO. 267/81-CUSTOMS

S.O. 3344.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Panipat in the State of Haryana to be a warehousing station.

[F. No. 473/131/81-CUS. VII]
A. K. CHHABRA, Secy.**वणिज्य मंत्रालय**

संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यातक, आयात एवं निर्यात का कार्यालय

लाइसेंस रद्द करने का आदेश

हैदराबाद, 31 अक्टूबर, 1981

का.अं. 3345.—सर्वश्री मिश्रा धातु निगम लि. डाकबाना, कंचन बाग, हैदराबाद-500258 को स्ट्रेप डिस्पेंसिंग यूनिट्स, टेंशनर्स, सीटर्स, कटर्स, सन्तुलक आदि और आवश्यक फालतु पूर्ण और परिष्कृत आपूर्ति जैसे सभी उपकरणों के साथ हाथ से चलने वाले एवं स्वतः चलित स्ट्रेपिंग मशीन कंप्यूटर का आयात करने के लिए 1,74,296/- रुपये के लागत सीमा भाड़ा शुल्क के लिए एक आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पी/सीजी/2074807/सी/एक्स एक्स/72/डब्ल्यू/79, दिनांक 24-8-79 प्रदान किया जाता था। पार्टी ने उपर्युक्त आयात लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति प्रदान करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति उनसे जो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। पार्टी ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियमावली के अनुसार आवश्यक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है जिसके अनुसार आयात लाइसेंस की उपर्युक्त सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जम्माई सीमा शुल्क कार्यालय के पास पंजीकृत कराने के पश्चात् अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। पार्टी ने यह भी वक्तव्य दिया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति यदि खोजने पर बाव में मिल गई या प्राप्त हो गई तो लाइसेंस अधिकारी को लौटा दी जाएगी।

मैं सन्तुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति उपयोग में लाए बिना ही जो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। मूल लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति एतद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

[मिडिल सं. आईटीसी/एच/सीजी/8/जी/एच-80/हैद]

एन.बी. प्रधान, उप-मुख्य निर्यातक

उत्ते संयुक्त मुख्य निर्यातक आयात एवं निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

CANCELLATION ORDER

Hyderabad, the 31st October, 1981

S.O. 3345.—M/s. Mishra Dhatu Nigam Ltd., P. O. Kan-
chan Bagh, Hyderabad-500258 were granted an import licence
No. P/CG/2074807/C/XX/72/W/79, dated 24-8-79 for a
C.I.F. value of Rs. 1,74,296 for import of Manual and
Automatic Strapping Machines—complete with all necessary
accessories like strap dispensing units, tensioners, sealers,
cutters, balances etc., and necessary spares and operating
supplies. The party has applied for grant of duplicate Customs
purposes copy for the aforesaid import licence on the
ground that the original customs purposes copy of licence
has been lost/misplaced by them. The party has furnished
necessary affidavit as per ITC rules according to which the
aforesaid customs purposes copy of import licence has been
misplaced after having been registered with Bombay Customs
House. The party has also undertaken to return to the
licensing authority the original Customs Purposes copy
of the licence if it is traced or found later on.

I am satisfied that the original Customs Purposes copy
of the licence has been lost/misplaced without being utilised
and direct that duplicate customs purposes copy of licence
should be issued to the applicant. The Customs Purposes
copy of the original licence is hereby cancelled.

[File No. ITC/AU/CG/8/G/AM. 80/Hyd.]

N. B. PRADHAN, Dy. Chief Controller
For Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात का कार्यालय)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3346.—सर्वश्री मोजागन डॉक लि., डॉकयार्ड रोड मोजागन, बम्बई, को अप्रैल—मार्च 78 की अधि के लिए संलग्न सूची के अनुसार आई एच सी बीवर 1500 ड्रिजर के उपयोग के लिए उपकरण और मशीनरी आदि का आयात करने के लिए 52,00,000 रुपए का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं. आई/ए/1077127/सी/एक्स एक्स/64/एच/77 दिनांक 2-8-77 प्रदान किया गया था।

2. अब फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अंगुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति सीमा शुल्क प्राधिकारी बम्बई के पास पंजीकृत कराने के पश्चात् और उसका 39,27,576 रुपए की सीमा तक उपयोग करने के पश्चात् अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। फर्म इस बात से सहमत है और बताने वेती है कि यदि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति बाद में मिल गई तो इस कार्यालय को रिकार्ड के लिए लौटा देगी।

3. अपने तर्कों के समर्थन में फर्म ने आयात-निर्यात क्रिया-विधि हैंड बुक 1981-82 के अध्याय 15 की कड़िका 352 में यथा अपेक्षित एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस आई/ए 1077127 दिनांक 2-8-77 की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आवेदक को लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अंगुलिपि प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति रद्द कर दी गई है।

4. आयात लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति की अंगुलिपि प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[फाईल सं./एमएडी/20-77-78-पीएलएम(बी)]

शंकर चन्द, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात
कृते मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात एवं निर्यात

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1981

S.O. 3346.—M/s. Mazagon Dock Limited, Dockyard Road, Mazagon, Bombay, were granted an Import Licence No. I/A/1077127/C/XX[64]H/77 dated 2nd August, 1977 for Rs. 52,00,000 only for the import of Equipment and machinery etc., for the use on IHC Beaver 1500 Dredger as per list attached for the period April—March 1978.

2. The firm have now requested for the issue of duplicate copy of Customs Purposes copy of the above licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes Copy has been misplaced after having been registered with the Customs Authority at Bombay and utilized to the extent of Rs. 39,27,576. The firm agrees and undertakes to return the original Customs Purposes Copy of the licence if traced later to this office for record.

3. In support of their contention the firm have filed an affidavit as required in Para 352 of Chapter XV of Hand Book of Import-Export Procedures 1981-82. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs Purposes Copy of Import Licence No. I/A/1077127 dated 2nd August, 1977 has been lost and directs that duplicate copy of the Customs Purposes Copy of the licence may be issued to the applicant.

The original Customs Purposes Copy of the licence has been cancelled.

4. The duplicate copy of Customs Purposes Copy of the Import licence is being issued separately.

[P. F. No. MAD/20/77-78/PLS(B)]

SHANKAR CHAND, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports,
For Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

विदेश मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 16 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3347.—राजनयिक तथा कोंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वां) के खंड 2 की धारा (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा यमन अरब गणराज्य स्थित भारत का राजदूतावास, साना में सहायक श्री ओ. के. मेहता को तत्काल से कोंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फा. सं. टी. 4330/1/81]

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 16th November, 1981

S.O. 3347.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri O. K. Mehla, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Sana'a, Yemen Arab Republic, to perform the duties of a Consular Agent with immediate effect.

[F. No. T-4330/1/81]

नई दिल्ली, 17 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3348.—राजनयिक तथा कोंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 41वां) के खंड 2 की धारा (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा, भारत का प्रधान कोंसलावास, ओडेसा में सहायक श्री एम. एल. अरोड़ा को श्री एम. एल. राज्यपाल, निजी सहायक जो गृह अवकाश पर भारत गए हैं, की अनुपस्थिति में कोंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फाइल सं. टी-4330/1/81]

New Delhi, the 17th November, 1981

S.O. 3348.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby authorises Shri M. L. Arora, Assistant in the Consulate General of India, Odessa to perform the duties of a Consular Agent during the period of absence of Shri M. L. Rajpal, Personal Assistant proceeding on home-leave to India.

[File No. T. 4330/1/81]

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3349.—राजनयिक तथा कोंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वां) के खंड 2 की धारा (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा, भारत का सहायक आई. कमीशन कीटो में सहायक श्री बी. एस. विश्वास और डी. पाल को कोंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फाइल सं. टी. 4330/1/81]

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1981

S.O. 3349.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby authorises S/Shri B. S. Bist, Assistant and D. Pal, Assistant in the Assistant High Commission of India, Kandy to perform the duties of a Consular Agent.

[File No. T. 4330/1/81]

नई दिल्ली, 19 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3350.—राजनयिक तथा कौंसली अधिकारी (शपथ एवं शुल्क) अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41वाँ) के खंड 2 की धारा (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा भारत का राजदूतावास, मीडिड में सहायक श्री एच. एल. सेठी को तत्काल से कौंसली एजेंट का कार्य करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

[फ. सं. टो-4330/1/81]

जे. हजारी, अवसर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th November, 1981

S.O. 3350.—In pursuance of the clause (a) of Section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby authorises Shri H. L. Sethi, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Madrid, to perform the duties of a Consular Agent with immediate effect.

[File No. T. 4330/1/81]

J. HAZARI, Under Secy.

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3351.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3 उपखंड (2) तारीख 19 मार्च, 1980 में प्रकाशित, 1252.83 एकड़ (लगभग) या 506.99 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि की बाबत कोयले का पर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि के एक भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय, कोयला विभाग की अधिसूचना सं.का.आ. 289 तारीख 12 जनवरी, 1981 के अनुक्रम में इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 85.54 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 211.37 (लगभग) माप की भूमि के भाग को अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है।

टिप्पण—1 इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले रैखान का निरीक्षण आयुक्त चंद्रपुर महाराष्ट्र के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1 कार्जसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में अथवा वीस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्थान अनुभाग) कोल ऐस्टेट सिविल लाइन्स नागपुर (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

टिप्पण—2 कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 8 के उपबन्धों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबन्धित है—

अर्जन पर आपत्तियां —

8(1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

स्पष्टीकरण—इस धारा के अन्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं करना चाहता है, और ऐसी संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करना चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच, यदि कोई है, करने के पश्चात् जो यह आवश्यक समझता है वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विमर्श के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता यदि भूमि या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते।

टिप्पण 3— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला नियंत्रक, 1 कार्जसिल स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता को उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है।

अनुसूची

हिन्दुस्तान लालपेठ बिहुत खान परिचोजना बडी घाटी कोलकोहस
जिला चम्पूर (महाराष्ट्र)

सभी अधिकार रेखांक सं.सी-1(ई)/III/जे० आर०/185-0381

राजस्थान भूमि तारीख 11-3-81

(जिसमें अर्जित की जाने वाली भूमि वर्णित की गई है)

क्रम सं० ग्राम	पी०मी० सं०	तहसील और जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणियां
1. माना	0	चम्पूर	60.23	भाग
2. नन्दावा	6	"	25.31	"

कुल क्षेत्र 85.54 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

या 211.37 एकर (लगभग)

ग्राम माना से अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याएं

43, 44, 49, 50, 51 (भाग), 57 से 62, 73 और नाला का भाग
ग्राम नंदगांव में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लाट संख्याएं1 (भाग), 2/1, 2/2-2/3 (भाग), 2/4 (भाग), 3/3-3/4 (भाग),
3/8 (भाग), 3/9 (भाग), 40/2 (भाग), 40/3 (भाग), 40/4 (भाग)
और 40/5 (भाग)

सीमा वर्णन

क-ख रेखा ग्राम नंदगांव के प्लाट सं० 3/8, 3/9, 3/3-3/4-2/4
में से होकर गुजरती है और ग्राम माना और नंदगांव की
साझी सीमा पर बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है।ख-ग रेखा ग्राम में से होकर, प्लाट सं० 57 की पूर्वी सीमा के
साथ गुजरती है और प्लाट सं० 51 में से होकर आगे जाती
है, और प्लाट सं० 51 और 51 की साझी सीमा पर बिन्दु
'ग' पर मिलती है।ग-घ रेखा, ग्राम माना के प्लाट सं० 51, 52 में से होकर गुजरती
है और ग्राम की सड़क के पूर्वी-और बिन्दु 'घ' पर मिलती
है।घ-ङ रेखा ग्राम माना में से होकर ग्राम की सड़क पूर्वी और
के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और प्लाट सं० 11 और 15 की सीमा
पर बिन्दु 'ङ' पर मिलती है।ङ-च रेखा, ग्राम माना में से होकर प्लाट सं० 44 और 45 की
साझी सीमा के साथ-साथ गुजरती है और तब प्लाट सं०
49, 17, 51, 62 की पश्चिमी सीमा के साथ-साथ आगे
जाती है और नाला को पार करते हुए ग्राम नंदगांव में से
होकर आगे जाती है और प्लाट सं० 2/2-2/3 की पश्चिमी
सीमा पर बिन्दु 'च' पर मिलती है।रेखा नंदगांव के प्लाट सं० 2/2-2/3, 40/5, 40/4, 40/3,
40/2, 3/9 और 3/8 में से होकर गुजरती है और आरंभिक
बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19/43/80-सी० प्ल० (जिल्ह 2)]

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

*S.O.3351.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Coal, Department of Coal, No. S. O. 798, dated the 12th March, 1980, under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), and published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3-Sub-section (ii), dated the 29th March, 1980, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 1252.83 acres (approximately) or 506.99 hectares (approximately) of the lands in the localities specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of the said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of

Energy, Department of Coal, No. S. O. 289, dated the 12th January, 1981, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire a part of the said lands measuring 85.54 hectares (approximately) or 211.37 acres (approximately) as described in the Schedule appended hereto.

Note 1 : The plans of the areas covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Collector, Chandrapur (Maharashtra) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the Office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur (Maharashtra).

Note 2 : Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the aforesaid Act which provide as follows :

OBJECTIONS TO ACQUISITION :—

"8(1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

Explanation:—It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operation should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

(2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing, and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall after hearing all such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of the proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

(3) For the purposes of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act."

Note 3 : The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta, has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act.

SCHEDULE

Hindustan Lalpeth Open Cast Project

Wardha Valley Coalfield

District Chandrapur (Maharashtra)

All Rights DRG. No. C-1 (E)/III/JR/185-0381
dated 11-3-81.

Revenue Land (showing lands to be acquired)

Serial No.	Village	P.C. No.	Tahsil and District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	Mana	6	Chandrapur	60.23	Part
2.	Nandgaon	6	-do-	25.31	Part

Total.. 85.54 hectares
(approximately)

OR
211.37 acres
(approximately)

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Mana :

43, 44, 49, 50, 51(P), 52(P), 57 to 62, 73 and part of a nalla

Plot numbers to be acquired in village Nandgaon :

1(P), 2/1 2/2-2/3(P), 2/4(P), 3/3-3/4(P), 3/8(P), 3/9(P), 40/2(P), 40/3(P), 40/4(P) and 40/5(P).

Boundary description

A-B	Line passes through village Nandgaon in plot nos. 3/8, 3/9, 3/3-3/4 and 2/4 and meets on the common boundary of villages Mana and Nandgaon at point 'B'.
B-C	Line passes through village Mana along the eastern boundary of plot No. 57 then proceeds through plot No. 51 and meets on the common boundary of plot nos. 51 and 54 at point 'C'.
C-D	Line passes through village Mana in plot Nos. 51, 52 and meets on the eastern side of village road at point 'D'.
D-E	Line passes through village Mana along the eastern side of the village road and meets on the boundary of plot Nos. 44 and 45 at point 'E'.
E-F	Line passes through village Mana along the common boundary of plot Nos. 44 and 45 then proceeds along the western boundary of plot Nos. 49, 73, 51 and 62 crossing over the Nalla, proceeds through village Nandgaon and meets on western boundary of plot Nos. 2/2-2/3 at point 'F'.
F-A	Line passes through village Nandgaon in plot Nos. 2/2-2/3, 40/5, 40/4, 40/3, 40/2, 3/9 and 3/8 and joins the starting point at 'A'.

[No. 19/43/80-CL (Vol. II)]

का. आ. 3352.—केंद्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला भारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं. 759 तारीख 23 फरवरी 1981 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र में भूमि का अर्जन करने को अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अनुसूचन में अपनी रिपोर्ट केंद्रीय सरकार को दे दी है ;

और केंद्रीय सरकार का, पूर्वोक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने और बिहार सरकार से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् यह समाधान हो गया है कि इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 270.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 109.26 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए ;

अतः, केंद्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित 270.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 109.26 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि का अर्जन किया जाता है ।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण उपायुक्त हजारी बाग (बिहार) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1-काउन्सिल हाउस, स्टूट कलकत्ता के

कार्यालय में या सेन्ट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनु-भाग) दरभंगा हाउस, रांची (बिहार) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

अनुसूची

पिशा-वतमा विस्तार ब्लॉक (पश्चिमी बोकारो कोयला क्षेत्र)

रेखांक सं० राजस्व /49/81

तारीख 5-5-81

सभी अधिकार (जिसमें अर्जित की गई भूमि वर्णित की गई है)

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	याना	याना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणियाँ
1	राबोध	मांडू	51	हजारीबाग	भाग	
						कुल क्षेत्र 270.00 एकड़ (लगभग) या 109.26 हेक्टर (4)

राबोध ग्राम में अर्जित किए गए प्लॉट संख्या :-

506 (भाग), 1219 (भाग), 1220 (भाग), 1221 (भाग), 1222, 1223, 1224 (भाग), 1225 (भाग), 1226 (भाग), 1227 (भाग), 1228 (भाग), 1229 (भाग), 1230 (भाग), 1231 से 1257, 1258 (भाग), 1273 (भाग), 1293 (भाग), 1284 (भाग), 1285 से 1290, 1291 (भाग), 1292 से 1305, 1306 (भाग), 1313 (भाग), 1364 (भाग), 1365 से 1368, 1369 (भाग), 1370 (भाग), 1380 (भाग), 1381 (भाग), 1382 (भाग), 1383, 1384 (भाग), 1385 (भाग), 1386 (भाग), 1387 (भाग), 1388, 1389, 1390 (भाग), 1391 (भाग), 1392 (भाग), 1393 (भाग), 1394 (भाग), 1395 (भाग), 1396 (भाग), 1397 (भाग), 1398 (भाग), 1399 (भाग), 1400 (भाग), 1401, 1412, 1413 (भाग), 1422 (भाग), 1423 (भाग), 1425 (भाग), 1432 (भाग), 1444 (भाग), 1450 (भाग), 1451, 1452 (भाग), 1453 से 1482, 1483 (भाग), 1484 से 1499, 1500 (भाग), 1501 से 1513, 1514 (भाग), 1515, 1516, 1517 (भाग), 1520 (भाग), 1521 (भाग), 1522 (भाग), 1531 (भाग), 1540 (भाग), 1582 (भाग), 1583, 1584, 1585

सीमा वर्णन :

क-ख रेखा ग्राम राबोध के प्लॉट संख्यांक 1582, 1450, 1444, 1452, 1432, 1425, 1423, 1422, 1413, 1364, 1370, 1369, 1400, 1399, 1398, 1397, 1396, 1395, 1394, 1393, 1392, 1391, 1390, 1387, 1386, 1385, 1384, 1383, 1382, 1381, 1380, 1313, 1306, 1291, 1284, 1283, 506, 1273, 1258 और 1230 में से होकर जाती है ।

ख-ग रेखा ग्राम राबोध के प्लॉट संख्यांक 1230, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1224, 1221, 1220, 1219, 1540, 1500, 1483, 1514, 1517, 1520, 1522, 1521, 1534 और 1483 में से होकर जाती है ।

ग-घ रेखा ग्राम राबोध और वतमा की भागत-सादी सीमा के साथ-साथ होकर जाती है ।

घ-ङ रेखा ग्राम राबोध और पिशा की भागत-सादी सीमा के साथ-साथ होकर जाती है और आर्द्धिक दिवस "क" पर मिलती है ।

[सं० 19/62/81-सी० एल०]

स्वर्णामह, यत्नर सचिव

S.O. 3352.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Coal), No. S.O. 758, dated the 23rd February, 1981, under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule appended to that notification ;

And whereas the competent authority, in pursuance of section 8 of the said Act, has made his report to the Central Government;

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the report aforesaid, and after consulting the Government of Bihar, is satisfied that the lands measuring 270.00 acres (approximately) or 109.26 hectares (approximately), described in the Schedule appended hereto, should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the land measuring 270.00 acres (approximately) or 109.26 hectares (approximately), described in the said Schedule, are hereby acquired.

The plan of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Bihar) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the Office of the Central Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section) Darbhanga House, Ranchi (Bihar).

SCHEDULE

Drg. No. Rev/49/81

Dated 5-5-81

Pindra Datma Extension Block (Showing lands acquired)
(West Bokaro Coalfield)

All Rights

Serial No.	Village	Thana	Thana No.	District	Area	Remarks
1.	Rabodh	Mandu	51	Hazaribagh	Part	
Total area :—270.00 acres (approximately) or 109.26 hectares (approximately)						

Plot numbers acquired in village Rabodh :—

506(P), 1219(P), 1220 (Part), 1221(part), 1222, 1223, 1224 (part), 1225 (Part), 1226(part), 1227(part), 1228(part), 1229, (part), 1230 (part) 1231 to 1257, 1258 (part), 1273 (part), 1283 (part), 1284 (part), 1285 to 1290, 1291 (part), 1292 to 1305, 1306 (part), 1313 (part), 1364 (part), 1365 to 1368, 1369 (part), 1370 (part), 1380 (part), 1381 (part), 1382 (part), 1383 (part), 1384 (part), 1385 (part), 1386 (part), 1387 (part), 1388, 1389 1390 (part), 1391 (part), 1392 (part), 1393 (part), 1394 (part), 1395 (part), 1396 (part), 1397 (part), 1398 (part), 1399 (part) 1400(part) 1401 to 1412, 1413 (part), 1422(part), 1423(part), 1425(part), 1432(part), 1444(part), 1450(part), 1451, 1452 (part), 1453 to 1482, 1483(part), 1484 to 1499, 1500 (part), 1501 to 1513 1514 (part), 1515, 1516, 1517 (part), 1520 (part), 1521 (part), 1522 (part), 1534 (part), 1540 (part), 1582 (part) 1583, 1584, 1585.

Boundary description :—

- A-B line passes through plot numbers :—1582, 1450, 1444 1452, 1432, 1425, 1423, 1422, 1413, 1364, 1370, 1369, 1400, 1399, 1398, 1397, 1396, 1395, 1394, 1393, 1392, 1391, 1390, 1387, 1386, 1385, 1384, 1383, 1382, 1381 1380, 1313, 1306 1291, 1284, 1283, 506, 1273, 1258 and 1230 in village Rabodh.
- B-C line passes through plot numbers :— 1230, 1225, 1226 1227, 1228, 1229, 1224, 1221, 1220, 1219, 1540, 1500, 1483, 1514 1517, 1520, 1522, 1521, 1534 & 1483 in village Rabodh.
- C-D line passes along the part of common boundary of villages Rabodh and Dagma.
- D-A line passes along the part of common boundary of village Rabodh and Pindra and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 19/62/81-CL.]

का० आ० 3353.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इनमें उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अधिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है ;

धरा: केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कोयले का पूर्वावधान करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है ;

2. इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण सेंट्रल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) वरसंगा हाउस, रांची के कार्यालय में या उपायुक्त हजारी बाग (बिहार) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1 काउन्सिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कनकसा के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाली भूमि में निम्नलिखित सभी व्यक्ति, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी तथ्यों, जाटों और अन्य वस्तुओं को, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 90 दिन के भीतर राजस्व अधिकारी सेंट्रल कोल फोल्ड्स लिमिटेड वरसंगा हाउस, रांची को भेजेंगे ।

अनुसूची

उरीमेरी ब्लॉक विस्तार I (बलरामपुर)

(दक्षिणी करनपुरा कोयला क्षेत्र)

रेखांक सं० ए/24/81-

तारीख 18-2-81

(जिसमें पूर्वावधान के लिए अधिसूचित भूमि दर्शित की गई है)

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	थाना	थाना संख्यांक	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणियाँ
1.	उरीमेरी	बरका गाँव	155	हजारीबाग	610.01	भाग
2.	जरजरा	बरका गाँव	156	"	399.99	"
कुल क्षेत्र			1010.00	एकड़ (लगभग)		
या			408.72	हेक्टेर (लगभग)		

सीमा वर्णन

क-ख	रेखा उरीमेरी ग्राम में से होकर जो, कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन प्रजित किए गए उरीमेरी ब्लॉक की सांघी सीमा का भाग है जाती है ।
ख-ग	रेखा, दामोदर नदी के भागतः बाएँ किनारे के साथ-साथ होकर जाती है ।
ग-घ	रेखा, ग्राम उरीमेरी और गरसुला की भागतः सांघी सीमा के साथ-साथ और ग्राम जरजरा और गरसुला की भागतः सांघी सीमा के साथ होकर जाती है ।
घ-ङ	रेखा, ग्राम जरजरा में से होकर जाती है ।
ङ-क	रेखा, जरजरा और पोटंगा और उरीमेरी ग्रामों की भागतः सांघी सीमा के साथ साथ आंशिक रूप से गुजरती है और आंशिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है ।

[सं० 19/12/81-सी० एच० (पीटी)]

S.O. 3353.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands in the locality mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein;

The plan of the area covered by this notification can be inspected at the Office of the Central Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Darbhanga House, Ranchi or in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Bihar) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta.

All persons interested in the lands covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Revenue Office, Central Coalfields Limited, Darbhanga House, Ranchi within 90 days from the date of the publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

Urimari Block Extn.-I (Bairampur)
(South Karanpura Coalfield)

Drg. No. Rev/24/81

Dated : 18-2-81.

(Showing lands notified for prospecting)

Serial Number	Village	Thana	Thana number	District	Area	Remarks
1.	Urimari	Barkagaon	155	Hazaribagh	610.01	Part.
2.	Jarjara	Barkagaon	156	Hazaribagh	399.99	Part.
Total Area :				1010.00 acres (approximately)		
or :				408.72 Hectares (approximately)		

Boundary Description :—

A—B line passes through village Urimari (which forms part common boundary of the Urimari block acquires u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act).

B—C line passes along the part left bank of Damodar river.

C—D line passes along part common boundary of villages Urimari and Garsula and along part common boundary of villages Jarjara and Garsula.

D—E line passes through village Jarjara.

E—A line passes part along part common boundary of villages Jarjara and Potanga and Urimari and meets at starting point 'A'

[No. 19/12/81-CL (Pt. I)]

का० आ० 3354:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इससे उपरोक्त अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अधिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (प्रजन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवर्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है ,

इस अधिप्राप्त के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण कलकत्ता बरबान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1 काउन्सिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में अथवा निवेशक (निगमित योजना और परियोजना) ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, संकटोरिया डाकघर बिशरगढ़ जिला बरबान (पश्चिमी बंगाल) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाली भूमि में हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निर्दिष्ट सभी नक्शों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से 90 दिन के भीतर निदेशक (निगमित योजना और परियोजना), ईस्टर्न कोल-फील्ड्स लिमिटेड, संकटोरिया को भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची

बड़ा डिगरी ब्लॉक
रानी गंज कोयला क्षेत्र

रेखांक सं० एल आर/1923

तारीख 6-7-81

(जिसमें पूर्वोक्त के लिए अधिसूचित की गई भूमि दर्शाई गई है)

क्रम सं०	मौजा का नाम	थाना	पुलिस थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र (एकड़ों में)	टिप्पणियाँ
1.	छोटा डिगरी	53	हीरापुर	बर्दवान	241.00	संपूर्ण
2.	बड़ा डिगरी	54	"	"	409.25	"
3.	शान्रमार	55	"	"	189.20	"
					कुल क्षेत्र	919.45 एकड़ (लगभग)
					या	372.05 हेक्टेयर (लगभग)

सीमा वर्णन

क-ख-ग-घ	रेखा मौजा बड़ा डिगरी की उत्तरी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है।
घ-ङ	रेखा, मौजा छोटा डिगरी और मौजा बारदोरिया के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ङ" पर मिलती है।
ङ-च	रेखा, मौजा छोटा डिगरी और मौजा सांता के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "च" पर मिलती है।
च-छ	रेखा, मौजा बड़ा डिगरी और सांता के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "छ" पर मिलती है।
छ-ज	रेखा, मौजा शान्रमार और सांता के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ज" पर मिलती है।
ज-झ	रेखा, मौजा शान्रमार और मौजा लाकरा सांता के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "झ" पर मिलती है।
झ-ञ	रेखा, मौजा शान्रमार और मौजा पुरुषोत्तमपुर के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ञ" पर मिलती है।
ञ-ट	रेखा, मौजा बड़ा डिगरी और मौजा पुरुषोत्तमपुर के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ट" पर मिलती है।
ट-ड	रेखा, मौजा बड़ा डिगरी और मौजा बिष्णुनन्दपुर के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "ड" पर मिलती है।
ड-ध	रेखा, मौजा बड़ा डिगरी और मौजा पर मोहाना के बीच साझी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है, और आरंभिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19170/81-सी ५०]

S. O. 3354.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed ;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein;

The plan of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Burdwan (West Bengal) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the office of the Director (Corporate Planning and Projects), Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sanctoria, Post-Office Disbargarh, District Burdwan (West Bengal);

All persons interested in the lands covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Director (Corporate Planning and Projects), Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sanctoria, within a period of ninety days from the date of the publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

Bara Digari Block
Raniganj Coalfield

Drawing No. LR/1923

Dated : 6-7-81.

(showing lands notified for prospecting).

Sl. No.	Name of mouza	Thana No.	Police Station (Thana)	District	Area in Acres	Remarks
1.	Chottadigari	53	Hirapur	Burdwan	241.00	Full
2.	Baradigari	54	Hirapur	Burdwan	409.25	Full
3.	Shanramar	55	Hirapur	Burdwan	189.20	Full

Total Area : 919.45 acres (approximately)
or : 372.05 hectares (approximately).

Boundary Description :

- A—B—C—D Lines pass along the northern boundary of mouza Baradigari and meet at point 'D'.
 D—E Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Chottadigari and Barteria and meets at point 'E'.
 E—F Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Chottadigari and Santa and meets at point 'F'.
 F—G Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Baradigari and Santa and meets at point 'G'.
 G—H Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Shanmar and Santa and meets at point 'H'.
 H—I Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Shanmar and Lakrasanta and meets at point 'I'.
 I—J Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Shanmar and Purusottampur and meets at point 'J'.
 J—K Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Baradigari and Purusottampur and meets at point 'K'.
 K—L Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Baradigari and Bidi naidapur and meets at point 'L'.
 L—A Line passes along the common boundary between mouzas Baradigari and Patmchana and meets at the starting point 'A'.

[No. 19/70-81-CL]

का० आ० 3355 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि इसमें उपाखण्ड अनुसूची में उल्लिखित भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त किए जाने की संभावना है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है ;

2. इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण सेंट्रल कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) दरभंगा हाउस, रांची के कार्यालय में या उपायुक्त गिरिडीह (बिहार) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल स्ट्रीट कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाली भूमि में हितबद्ध सभी व्यक्ति, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 13 की उपधारा (7) में निविष्ट सभी नक्शों, चार्टों और अन्य दस्तावेजों को, इस अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन का तारोख से 90 दिन के भीतर राजस्व अधिकारी सेंट्रल कोल फील्ड्स लिमिटेड, दरभंगा हाउस, रांची का भेजेंगे।

अनुसूची

बालकड़ी ब्लाक विस्तार-II
 पूर्वी बोकारो कोयला क्षेत्र

रेखांक सं० राजस्व/52/81

तारीख 26-5-1981

(जिसमें पूर्वक्षण के लिए अधिसूचन की गई भूमि वंशित की गई है।)

उप-अनुसूची II

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	थाना	थाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्रफल	टिप्पणियां
1. जरीडीह		नवाडीह	19	गिरिडीह	590.00 भाग	एकड़ (लगभग)
			कुल क्षेत्र		590.00 एकड़ (लगभग)	
			या		238.76 हेक्टर (लगभग)	

सीमा वर्णन

- क-ख रेखा कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9 के अधीन अर्जित ग्राम जरीडीह में कुनार नदी के भागतः बाएं किनारे के साथ-साथ (जो कुनार नदी तल की साक्षी सीमा का भाग भी है) जाती है और बिन्दु "ख" पर मिलती है।
 ख-ग रेखा, ग्राम जरीडीह की कुनार नदी और वामोदर नदी के भागतः बाएं किनारे के साथ-साथ जाती है, (जो बिहार राज्य सरकार से बालू पट्टे पर लिए गए 736.11 एकड़ क्षेत्र की साक्षी सीमा का भाग है) और बिन्दु "ग" पर मिलती है।
 ग-घ रेखा, ग्राम जरीडीह की वामोदर नदी के भागतः बाएं किनारे के साथ-साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है।
 घ-ङ-च रेखाएं ग्राम जरीडीह में से होकर जाती हैं (जो बोकारो कोयला खान की साक्षी सीमा का भाग है) और बिन्दु "च" पर मिलती हैं।
 च-छ-ज-क रेखाएं ग्राम जरीडीह में से होकर जाती हैं और बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती हैं।

उप-ब्लॉक IV

क्रम संख्यांक	ग्राम	थाना	थाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणियां
1.	बालकड़ी	पेटारबर	46	गिरीडीह	1175.00	भाग एकड़ (लगभग)
कुल क्षेत्र या				1175.00 एकड़ (लगभग)	475.49 हेक्टर (लगभग)	

सीमा वर्णन

अ—अ—ट-ठ रेखाएं, ग्राम बालकड़ी में से होकर जाती हैं (जो बालकड़ी ब्लॉक विस्तार की साझी सीमा का भाग है) और बिन्दु ठ पर मिलती हैं।
ठ—ड रेखा, ग्राम बालकड़ी की दामोदर नदी के भागत बाएं किनारे के साथ-साथ होकर जाती है और प्रारम्भिक बिन्दु "ड" पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19/71/81(सी एल०)]

स्वर्ण सिंह, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3335.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that coal is likely to be obtained from the lands mentioned in the schedule hereto annexed ;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to prospect for coal therein ;

The plan of the area covered by this notification can be inspected in the Office of the Central Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section), Durbhanga House Ranchi, or in the office of the Deputy Commissioner, Giridih (Bihar), or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta.

All persons interested in the lands covered by this notification shall deliver all maps, charts and other documents referred to in sub-section (7) of section 13 of the said Act to the Revenue Officer, Central Coalfields Limited, Durbhanga House, Ranchi, within 90 days from the date of publication of this notification.

SCHEDULE

Chalkari Block Extn. II

East Bokaro Coalfield

Org. No. Rev/52/81

Dated 26-5-1981

(Showing lands notified for prospecting)

Sub-Block-III

Serial Number	Village	Thana	Thana Number	District	Area	Remarks
1.	Jaridih	Nawdih (Bermo)	19	Giridih	590.00 acres (approximately)	Part
Total Area :— 590.00 acres (approximately)						or : 238.76 hectares (approximately)

Boundary Description :—

A—B line passes along the part left bank of Kunar River in village Jaaridih (which is also part common boundary of River bed of Kunar River) acquired u/s 9 of the Coal Act and meets at point 'B'.

B—C line passes along the part left bank of Kunar and Damodar River of village Jaridih (which forms part common boundary of the area 736.11 acres taken for sand lease from State Govt. of Bihar) and meets at point 'C'.

C—D line passes along the part left bank of Damodar River of village Jaridih and meets at point 'D'.

D—E—F lines passes through village Jaridih (which forms part common boundary of Bokaro Colliery) and meets at point 'F'.

F—G—H—A lines pass through village Jaridih and meets at starting point 'A'.

Sub-Block-IV

Serial Number	Village	Thana	Thana Number	District	Area	Remarks
1.	Chalkari	Potarbar	46	Giridih	1175.00 acres (approximately)	Part
Total area :-1175.00 acres (approximately) or : 475.49 hectares (approximately)						

Boundary Description :

I—K—L lines pass through village Chalkari (which forms part common boundary of Chalkari Block Extn.) and meets at point 'L'. L—I line passes along the part right bank of River Damodar of village Chalkari and meets at starting point 'I'.

[No. 19/71/81-CL]
SWARAN SINGH, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1981

का. आ. 3356.—यतः भारतीय नर्सिंग परिषद् ने भारतीय नर्सिंग परिषद् अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 48) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (2) के अनुसरण में 5 अप्रैल, 1980 को हुई बैठक में पारित प्रस्ताव द्वारा यह घोषित किया है कि कालेज आफ नर्सिंग, क्रिश्चियन मेडिकल कालेज और अस्पताल, वेल्लोर द्वारा जुलाई, 1967 से प्रदत्त आपरेंटिंग कक्ष तकनीक एवं प्रबंध में पोस्ट सर्टिफिकेट कोर्स का डिप्लोमा उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए मान्यताप्राप्त उच्चतर अर्हता है;

और यतः उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 15 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा यथापक्षित उक्त प्रस्ताव को भारतीय नर्सिंग परिषद् की 5 जुलाई, 1980 की अधिसूचना संख्या 11-1-1976-आई एन सी के साथ सरकारी राजपत्र में प्रकाशित कर दिया गया है;

अतः अब उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 15 की उप-धारा (2) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है ताकि इसे उक्त घोषणा के अनुरूप बनाया जा सके, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची के भाग-2 में शीर्ष-“मान्यता-प्राप्त उच्चतर अर्हता” के अंतर्गत प्रविष्टि 32 के बाद निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि की जाएगी अर्थात् :—

“33. कालेज आफ नर्सिंग क्रिश्चियन मेडिकल कालेज और अस्पताल, वेल्लोर ।

जुलाई, 1967 को या इसके बाद प्रदत्त आपरेंटिंग कक्ष तकनीक एवं प्रबंध में पोस्ट सर्टिफिकेट डिप्लोमा ।

[सं. वी-14015/81/पी एम एस]

एन. ए. सूब्रह्मण्य, जवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

New Delhi, the 23 November, 1981

S.O. 3356.—Whereas the Indian Nursing Council has, by a resolution passed at a meeting held on the 5th April, 1980 in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Indian Nursing Act, 1947 (48 of 1947) declared that the Diploma in Post Certificate Course in Operating Room Technique and Manage-

ment granted by the College of Nursing, Christian Medical College and Hospital, Vellore with effect from July, 1967 shall be recognised as higher qualification for the purposes of the said Act;

And whereas the said resolution has been published in the Official Gazette with the notification of the Indian Nursing Council No. 11-1/76-INC, dated the 15th July, 1980, as required by sub-section (1) of section 15 of the said Act;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 15 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Schedule to the said Act so as to bring it into accord with the said declaration namely :—

In the Schedule to the said Act, in part-II, under the heading “Recognised Higher Qualification”, after entry 32, the following entry shall be inserted, namely :—

“33. The College of Nursing, Post-Certificate Diploma in Christian Medical Col-Operating Room Technique and lege and Hospital, Vellore. Management granted on or after July, 1967.

[No. V.14025/1/81-PMS]
N. A. SUBRAMONEY, Under Secy.

कृषि मंत्रालय

(कृषि और सहकारिता विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 29 सितम्बर, 1981

का. आ. 3357.—पशु आयात अधिनियम, 1898 (1898 का अधिनियम, 9) के खण्ड-3 उप-खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार 27-8-1981 से तीन महीने की अवधि के लिए यू. के., आयरलैण्ड, फ्रान्स, क्षमरीका, आस्ट्रेलिया, जर्मन संघीय गणराज्य, बेलजियम, डेनमार्क और इटली से अश्वजातीय पशुओं के आयात पर एतद्वारा प्रतिबन्ध लगाती है । यह प्रतिबन्ध 4 वर्ष तक की आयु के अश्वकों और अश्व-शवकों (फोलीज) पर लागू नहीं होगा जिनका कभी मेल नहीं कराया गया है और जो प्रजनक स्टाफ के सम्पर्क में नहीं रहे हैं, बशर्त कि :—

(क) अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत विनिर्दिष्ट स्वास्थ्य सम्बन्धी आवश्यकताओं के अतिरिक्त युवा अश्व-जातीय पशुओं के साथ प्राधिकृत पशु-चिकित्सक

का इस आशय का पशुचिकित्सा सम्बन्धी एक स्वास्थ्य प्रमाणपत्र हो कि पशुगत एक वर्ष के दौरान प्रजनक स्टाफ के सम्पर्क में नहीं रहा है और इन पशुओं के लिंगच्छद तथा मूत्रद्वार/योनि और सरविकस से एकत्र की गई फ़ेरी मानक संवर्धनक और सीरम सम्बन्धी पद्धतियों द्वारा व्याधि विषयक सूक्ष्म अणुओं, विशेषकर हीमोफिलियस इक्वीजैनीटेल्स के लिए न्यायन हेतु पोत रोहण के 30 दिनों के अन्तर निरन्तर तीन परीक्षण करने पर नकारात्मक पाई गई है।

- (ख) भारत में प्राप्त किए जाने पर आयातित पशुओं को कृषि मंत्रालय द्वारा स्वीकृत परिसर में 30 दिन तक अलग रखा जाएगा। संरोध की अवधि के दौरान पशुओं की एक मान्यताप्राप्त प्रयोगशाला में साप्ताहिक अन्तराग पर निरन्तर तीन बार जीवाणु और सीरम सम्बन्धी संवर्धनक जांच की जाएगी और संक्रामक अश्वजातीय मैट्रिडिटिस (कान्टेजियस इक्वाइन मैट्रिडिटिस) रोग के लिए नकारात्मक घोषित किए जाने के बाद ही इन पशुओं को अन्य पशुओं के साथ मिलाया जाएगा।

[सं. 50-22/77-एल डी टी (एल एच-ए क्यू) खण्ड-2]

एम. एस. खुराना, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agriculture & Cooperation)

New Delhi, the 28th September, 1981

S.O. 3357.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of section 3 of Livestock Importation Act, 1898 (Act 9 of 1898), the Central Government hereby prohibit for a period of three months with effect from 27th August, 1981 the import from U.K., Ireland, France, U.S.A., Australia, Federal Republic of Germany, Belgium, Japan, Denmark and Italy of the equine species of animals except colts and fillies upto 4 years of age which have never been mated and have not been in contact with breeding stock provided that—

- (a) In addition to the health requirements specified under the Act the Young equines are accompanied by a Veterinary Health Certificate from an authorised Veterinarian that the animals have not been in contact with the breeding stock during the last one year and that the swabs collected from prepuce and Urethra/vagina and Cervix of these animals were found negative for pathogenic microorganism specifically Faemophilus equigenitalis, by standard cultural & serological methods, on three consecutive testings within 30 days of embarkation for export.
- (b) On receipt in India such imported animals are kept in Quarantine for 30 days at the premises approved by the Ministry of Agriculture During the quarantine period the animals shall be subjected to bacteriological and serological examination by a recognised laboratory on three consecutive conducted at weekly interval and will be mixed with other stock only when declared negative for contagious equine metritis infection.

[No. 50/22/77-LDT(LH-AQ)Part II]
M. S. KHURANA, Under Secy.

ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 1981

का. आ. 3358.—मधु श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन नियम, 1970 का और संशोधन करने के लिए कतिपय नियमों का एक प्रारूप, कृषि उपज (श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन) अधिनियम, 1937 (1937 का 1) की धारा 3 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित भारत सरकार के ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण मंत्रालय की अधिमूचना संख्या का.आ. 3185 तारीख 30 अक्टूबर, 1980 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग-2, खण्ड 3, उपखंड (2) तारीख 15 नवम्बर, 1980 के पृष्ठ 3980 पर प्रकाशित किया गया था, जिसमें उक्त अधिमूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पैंतालीस दिन की अवधि की समाप्ति के पूर्व उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप और सुझाव मांगे गए थे, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी;

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां 29 नवम्बर, 1980 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों और सुझावों पर विचार कर लिया है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मधु श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन नियम, 1970 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम मधु श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन (संशोधन) नियम, 1981 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. मधु श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन नियम, 1970 नियम 5 में—

(क) उप-नियम (1) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(1) मधु कांश के स्वच्छ पात्रों में (जो अधिमानत ऋद्धि मूह वाले होंगे) या पीनीमिट्टी के बर्तनों में या नए, स्वच्छ और लेकर किए गए कैनो या टिनो या मोम बोंधत गत्ते के डिब्बों में या किसी अन्य ऐसे पात्र में जो भारत सरकार के कृषि विपणन सलाहकार द्वारा समय-समय पर, अनुमोदित किया जाए, पैक किया जाएगा”;

(ख) उपनियम (3) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(3) किसी पैकेज में मधु का शुद्ध वजन 25 ग्राम, 50 ग्राम, 100 ग्राम, 200 ग्राम, 500 ग्राम, 1 किलोग्राम, 2 किलोग्राम, 5 किलोग्राम होगा और उसके पश्चात् बैरल में 5 किलोग्राम के गुणक से होगा।”

टिप्पण:—मधु श्रेणीकरण और चिह्नांकन नियम, 1970 का पहला संशोधन 1977 में किया गया था। देखिए भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3 (2), तारीख 22 अक्टूबर, 1977 में का.आ.सं. 3320 के रूप में प्रकाशित कृषि और सिंचाई मंत्रालय की अधिमूचना का.सं. 13-10/75, ए.एम., तारीख 30 सितम्बर, 1977।

[सं. 10-15/79-ए.एम.]

गन्धर्व सिंह, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3358.—Whereas a draft of certain rules further to amend the Honey Grading and Marking Rules, 1970, were published, as required by section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937), at pages 3980 and 3981 of the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii), dated the 15th November, 1980, with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Rural Reconstruction, No. S.O. 3185, dated the 30th October, 1980, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby before the expiry of a period of forty five days from the date of publication of the said notification in the Official Gazette.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made made available to the public on the 29th November, 1980;

And whereas objections and suggestions received from the public in respect of the said draft have been considered by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Honey Grading and Marking Rules, 1970, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Honey Grading and Marking (Amendment) Rules, 1981.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Honey Grading and Marking Rules, 1970, in rule 5,—

(a) for sub-rule (1), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(1) The Honey shall be packed in clean glass containers (preferably wide-mouthed) or china-ware or new, clean and lacquered cans or tins or wax impregnated paper cartons or any other containers as may be approved by the Agricultural Marketing Adviser to the Government of India from time to time”;

(b) for sub-rule (3), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“(3) the net weight of honey in a package shall be 25 gms., 50 gms., 100 gms., 200 gms., 500 gms., 1 kg., 2 kgs., 5 kgs., and thereafter in multiples of 5 kgs. in barrel”.

Note.—The Honey Grading and Marketing Rules 1970 were first amended in 1977 vide notification No. F. 13-10/75-AM dated the 30th September, 1977 of the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation published as S.O. No. 3320 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated the 22nd October, 1977.

[No. 10-15/79-AM]
GANDHARY SINGH, Under Secy.

संस्कृति विभाग

भारतीय पुरातत्व सर्वेक्षण

नई दिल्ली, 16 नवम्बर, 1981

(पुरातत्व)

क्रा० आ० 3359.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2 खंड 3, उप-खंड (ii) तारीख 27 सितम्बर, 1980 में प्रकाशित, भारत सरकार के संस्कृति विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० क्रा० आ० 2580 तारीख 22 अगस्त, 1980 द्वारा, उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त प्राचीन स्थल को राष्ट्रीय महत्व का घोषित करने के अपने आशय की दो मास की सूचना दी थी और प्राचीन संस्मारक तथा पुरातत्वीय स्थल और अवशेष अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 24) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (1) में यथा प्रवेक्षित उक्त सूचना की एक प्रति को उक्त प्राचीन स्थल के पान सहज दृश्य स्थान पर बिफका दिया गया था ;

और उक्त अधिसूचना वाले राजपत्र की प्रतियां जनता को 1 सितम्बर, 1980 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी और जनता से कोई आक्षेप प्राप्त नहीं हुआ था अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार प्राचीन संस्मारक तथा पुरातत्वीय स्थान और अवशेष अधिनियम, 1958 (1958 का 24) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नीचे अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट उक्त प्राचीन स्थल को राष्ट्रीय महत्व का घोषित करती है ।

अनुसूची

राज्य	जिला	तहसील	परिक्षेत्र	स्थल का नाम	संरक्षण के अधीन सम्मिलित किया जाने वाला राजस्व प्लॉट सं०	क्षेत्र	सीमाएं	स्वामित्व	टिप्पणी
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
मध्य प्रदेश	श्री काकुलम	श्री काकुलम	कलिंगपटनम्	सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 147/9 में समाविष्ट प्राचीन बुद्ध स्थल	सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 147/9	0.620 हैक्टर	उत्तर :—सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 147/4, 147/5, 147/6 और 147/8 पूर्व :—सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 148 और सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 147/10 का भाग दक्षिण :—सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 146 और 147/10 पश्चिम :—सर्वेक्षण प्लॉट सं० 65 और 147/8	राज्य सरकार	

[सं० 2/34/79-स्मा०]

डा० (श्रीमती) देबला मित्र, महाविदेशिक और पदेन संयुक्त सचिव

DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 16th November, 1981

(ARCHAEOLOGY)

S O 3359.—Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Culture No S O 2580, dated the 22nd August, 1980 published in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 27th September, 1980 the Central Government gave two months notice of its intention to declare the said ancient site, specified in the schedule to the said notification, to be of national importance, and a copy of the said notification was affixed

in a conspicuous place near the said ancient site as required in sub-section (1) of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 (24 of 1958);

And whereas the Gazette copies of the said notification were made available to the public on 1st November, 1980,

And whereas, no objections have been received from the public,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 (24 of 1958) the Central Government hereby declare the said ancient site specified in the schedule below to be of national importance.

SCHEDULE

State	District	Tehsil	Locality	Name of site	Revenue plot numbers included under protection	Area	Boundaries	Ownership	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Andhra Pradesh	Srikrishna	Srikrishna	Kaligatnam	Ancient Buddhist site comprised in survey plot No 147/9	Survey plot No. 147/9	0 620 Hectares	North :—Survey plot Nos 147/4, 147/5, 147/6 and 147/8 East :—Survey plot No. 148 and a portion of survey plot No. 147/10. South :—Survey plot Nos. 146 and 147/10. West :—Survey plot Nos 65 and 147/8.	State Government	—

[No. 2/34/79-M]

Dr. Mrs. MITRA, Director General
and Ex-Officio Joint Secretary

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 20 नवम्बर, 1981

क्र० आ० 3360—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या एम० क्र० 3792, दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 को प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किए गए विदेशों के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार फिल्म सत्ताधिकार बोर्ड, बम्बई को निष्कारणों पर विचार करने के बाद एतद्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के मामले उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई (मीटरों में)	आवेष्टक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और साप्ताहिक चट्टनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	प्रोब्लम ऑफ वि	75 89	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24, पैटर्न रोड, बम्बई-400026।		"डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
2	बाबासाहेब अम्बेडकर	437 69	—तथैव—		—तथैव—
3	डाक्टर्स एंड वार्ड्स (रंगीन)	277 00	फिल्म "वार्ड्स कारपोरेशन, शिवाब सन स्टूडियो, एम०जी० रोड, नवियेन्द्रम।	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार बम्बई।	"डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म" सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
4	कैप्टीन प्लानिंग-मोपल्लू भूषमेट (रंगीन)	370	फिल्म प्रभाग भारत सरकार, बम्बई।	फिल्म प्रभाग, 4-टानस्ताय मार्ग, नई दिल्ली-1	"सामयिक चट्टनाओं की फिल्म" सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।

1	2	3	4	5	6
5. बहियाली स्टोरी (रंगीन)	298	फिल्म प्रभाग भारत सरकार, बम्बई	फिल्म प्रभाग 4-टालम्टाय मार्ग नई दिल्ली	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
6. टू फ्रीड (रंगीन)	377.95	टी० एम० परमसीवैया, सं० 8, फुरुवर संघ बिल्डिंग, 11 क्राम गांधी नगर, बंगलौर।	एच० एम० एफ० मुनि, सं० 1, फुरुवर संघ बिल्डिंग, 11 क्राम, गांधी नगर, बंगलौर।	—तथैव—	
7. सहिती चित्र संख्या 352	213.36	सह सूचना निदेशक (फिल्म), गुजरात सरकार, रापनाई लेबा०, बम्बई-400018।	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, प्लॉक सं० 7, गांधी नगर-382010।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म गुजरात सर्किट प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
8. सहिती चित्र संख्या 366	299	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क महा-निदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेंटर, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-400034।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
9. बिहार समाचार चित्र भाग-1	259.08	श्री एम० झा, फिल्म सम्पादक, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क निदेशक, बिहार सरकार पटना।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। बिहार सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
10. बिहार समाचार चित्र भाग-2	243.84	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	
11. अतिथि एक व्यवसाय (जहाँ अतिथि एक पेशा है (रंगीन)	288.65	श्री एन० के० हुंजर फिल्म, 2-मित्रा मिलान, 68, जयल रोड, बम्बई-50	इसर फिल्मस, 2-मित्रा मिलान, 68, जयल रोड, बांद्रा, बम्बई-50।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
12. चारमिंग सिगनल	318	फाली बिलीमोरिया प्रोडक्शन, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		—तथैव—	
13. फलड हैवक इन राजस्थान	341	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-वैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026		—तथैव—	
14. आर्चिडज आफ सिक्किम (रंगीन)	275.00	—तथैव—		—तथैव—	
15. इनवीटेशन (रंगीन)	58.00	—तथैव—		शिक्षा सम्बन्धी फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
16. मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन-31	262.75	महायक सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल।	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क निदेशक, सं० प्र० भोपाल।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश समिति में प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
17. बिहार समाचार चित्र भाग-3	289.56	श्री एम० झा, फिल्म संपादक, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क निदेशक, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। बिहार सर्किट प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
18. बिहार समाचार चित्र भाग-4	298.70	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	
19. वर्न नरगिणि संख्या 16	292.68	ग्राम्य प्रदेश राज्य विकास निगम, गृहकल्प, एम० जी० रोड, हैवराबाद।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। ग्राम्य प्रदेश में प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
20. कृष्ण पुष्करम्	302.10	श्री एस० आर० चम्पन, 2-2-647/235/ए/14, श्रीनिवास नगर, हैवराबाद-44		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
21. क्राफ्ट्स आफ गोआ (रंगीन)	288.00	जे० एस० बंडेकर, एम-17, अम्बेडकर नगर, गोलनजी, हिल, जी० डी० अम्बेडकर मार्ग, बम्बई-12		—तथैव—	
22. इन्ही बहाविली माने प्रशाधी	258.78	सूचना और जनसम्पर्क महा-निदेशक, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेंटर, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		“डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म”	

1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	महिती चित्र संख्या 353	252.98	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनार्ड रिसेर्च लेबा०, 77 डी० एनी बेसेंट रोड, बम्बई-400018।	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, गांधी नगर, 382010।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
24.	वसीकेदार्ज-दि पेशनर्ज आफ अक्थ	601.07	मजबकर अली, ए० आई० मंवार, सोसायटी, जुहू गांव, बम्बई-400049।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
25.	रिन्यूएबल एनर्जी सोसिज	299.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय, 24, डी० जी० डी० देशमुख मार्ग, बम्बई-400026।		—तदेव—
26.	शक्ति (रंगीन)	546.00	ट्राइडेंट एंटर प्राइजिज 376, 14 वां रोड, बम्बई-52।		—तदेव—
27.	तुपजापुर (रंगीन)	302.00	सूचना और जन संपर्क महा-निदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, 68-नारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म महाराष्ट्र में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
28.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन संख्या 32	284.07	सहायक सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश सकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
29.	एक रुख सौ सुख (रंगीन)	296.28	श्री ए० आर० सरीन, सरीन प्रोड०, शकुल्ला। 4-पैडर रोड, शांताकुज (पूर्व), बम्बई-400054।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। पंजाब सकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
30.	पद्मदर्शक (संशोधित)	350.52	सहायक फिल्म निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनार्ड लेबा०, 77-डी० एनी बीसेंट रोड, बम्बई-18।	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, गांधी नगर, 382020।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। गुजरात सकिट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।

[फाइल संख्या 315/1/80-एफ(पी)]

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING
ORDER**

New Delhi, the 20th November, 1981

S.O. 3360.—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated 2nd December, 1966 the Central Government after considering recommendations of the Films Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the Film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the applicant	Name of the producer	Brief synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purpose of a film dealing with news current events documentary film.
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Problem of the Day	75.89	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		"Documentary" For General Release.
2.	Babasaheb Ambedkar	437.69	Do		Do
3.	Doctor's Advice (Col)	277.00	Film Line Corpn., Sivasan Studio, M.G. Road, Trivandrum.	Films Division, Govt. of India, Bombay.	"Documentary" for general release.

1	2	3	4	5	6
4. "Family Planning A Peoples Movement (Col)	370	Films Division, Govt. of India, Bombay.	Films Division 4-Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.	'Current Events' for general release.	
5. Khandiali Story (Col)	298	Do	Do	Documentary for general release.	
6. True Friend (Colour)	377.95	T.S. Paramasivaiah, No. 8 Kurubara Sangh Bldg., II Cross, Gandhi Nagar, Bangalore.	H.M.F. Murthy No. 1, Kurubara Sangh Bldg., II Cross, Gandhinagar, Bangalore.	Documentary for general release.	
7. Mahitichitra No 352	213.36	Asst. Director of Information (Films), Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Labs, Bombay-400018.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya Block No. 7, Gandhinagar-382010.	'News and Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.	
8. Maharashtra News No. 366.	299	Directorate General of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034.		'News and Current Events' in Maharashtra circuit.	
9. Bihar Samachar Chitra Part I	259.08	Shri M. Jha, Film Editor, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	Director of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar Patna.	'News & Current Events' in Bihar circuit.	
10. Bihar Samachar Chitra Part 2.	243.84	Do	Do	Do.	
11. Adhya Ek Vyavasaya (Where Hospitality Is A Profession) (Col.)	288.65	N.K. Issar, Issar Films 2-Mitra Milan, 68-Chapel Road, Bombay-50.	Issar Films, 2-Mitra Milan, 68-Chapel Road, Bandra, Bombay-50.	'Documentary' for general release	
12. Warning Signal	318.00	Fali Bilimoria Productions 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.	Fali Bilimoria Productions 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.	'Documentary' for general release.	
13. Flood Havoc in Rajasthan	241.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		Do.	
14. Orchids of Sikkim (Col.)	275.00	Do		Do	
15. Invitation (Col.)	58.00	Do		For general release as film intended for educational purposes.	
16. Madhya Pradesh Samachar Darshan-31.	262.75	Asst. Director Information & Publicity Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.	Director, Information & Publicity Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.	'News and Current Event' for Madhya Pradesh circuit.	
17. Bihar Samachar Chitra Part 3.	289.56	M. Jha, Film Editor, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	Director of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	'News and Current Events' for release in Bihar circuit.	
18. Bihar Samachar Chitra Part 4	298.70	Do	Do	Do	
19. Varta Tarangini No. 16	292.68	A.P. State Development Corp., Gruhakalpa, M.J. Rd., Hyderabad-500001	A.P. State Film Development Corporation, Gruhakalpa, M.J. Road, Hyderabad-500001.	'News and Current Events' for release in Andhra Pradesh.	
20. Krishna Pushkaram	302.10	S.R. Chandran, 2-2-647/235/A/14, Srinivasnagar, Hyderabad-44.	S.R. Chandran 2-2-647/225/A/14, Srinivasnagar, Hyderabad-44.	'Documentary' for general release.	
21. Crafts of Goa (Col.)	288.00	J.S. Bandekar, M-17, Ambedkar Nagar, Golanji Hills, G.D. Ambedkar Marg, Bombay-12.		'Documentary' for general release.	
22. Ithe Ghadavili Mane Udyachi.	258.78	Director General of Information and Public Relations, Government of Maharashtra, Film Center, 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary'	

1	2	3	4	5	6
23. Mahitichitra No. 353	252.98	Asst. Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Labs; 77-Dr. Annie Besant Road, Bombay-400018.	Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Gandhinagar, 382010.	News & Current Events for release in Gujarat circuit.	
24. Vaseqedars—The Pensioners of Avadh	601.07	Mazaffar Ali, A 1 Mandar Society, Juhu Village, Bombay-400049.		Documentary for General release.	
25. Renewable Energy Sources	299.00	Films Division, Govt. of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 24-Dr. G. Deshmukh Marg, Bombay-400026.		Documentary for general release.	
26. Shakti (Col.)	546.00	Trident Enterprises, 376, 14th Road, Bombay-52.		Documentary for general release	
27. Tuljapur (Col.)	302.00	Director General of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, 68-Tardeo, Bombay-34.		Documentary for release in Maharashtra.	
28. Madhya Pradesh Samachar Darshan No. 32	284.07	Asst. Director Information & Publicity, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.	Director of Information & Publicity, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh, Bhopal.	News & Current Events for release in Madhya Pradesh circuit.	
29. Ek Rukh Sau Sukh (Col.)	296.28		Shri H.R. Sarin, Sarin Productions "Shakuntala", 4-Podar Road, Santacruz (Est.), Bombay-400054.	Documentary for release in Punjab circuit.	
30. Pathdarshak (Revised)	350.52	Asst. Director of Films, Govt. of Gujarat Ramnord Labs, 77-Dr. Annie Vesant Road, Bombay-18	Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Gandhinagar-382010.	Documentary for Gujarat circuit.	

[File No. 315/1/80-F(P)]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 नवम्बर, 1981

मा० प्रा० 3361.—फिल्म गलाहकार बोर्ड के कार्यकरण से संबंधित विनियमों के नियम 14(ख) के उपबंधों के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपांतरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है —

अनुसूची

क्र०सं०	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई (मीटरों में)	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डकुमेंट्री फिल्म है
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1722	297	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24, पैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म।
2	(क) भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 (क्षेत्रीय पूर्व)	297	—तद्वैध—		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म, कुमशा: सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।
	(ख) भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 (क्षेत्रीय दक्षिण)	298	—तद्वैध—		—तद्वैध—

1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1724 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1724 (क्षेत्रीय पश्चिम)	302	फिल्म प्रभाग 24, पैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म क्रमशः सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।
4.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1725 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1725 (क्षेत्रीय उत्तर)	302	—तदेव—		—तदेव—

[फाइल संख्या 315/5/81-ए.फ. (पी०)]
सुकुमार मंडल, डैस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th November, 1981

S.O. 3361.—In exercise of the powers vested under the provisions of Rule 14(b) of the Regulations relating to the Working of the Film Advisory Board, the Central Government hereby approves films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their languages versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the applicant	Name of the Producer	Brief Synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purposes of a film dealing with news current documentary films
1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Indian News Review No. 1722	297 mtrs.	The Films Division 24, Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		News & Current events General.
2.	(a) Indian News Review No. 1723 and Indian News Review No. 1723 (Regional East).	297 mtrs.		Do.	News & Current events General & Regional release respectively.
	(b) Indian News Review No. 1723 and Indian News Review No. 1723 (Regional South)	298 mtrs.		Do.	Do.
3.	Indian News Review No. 1724 and Indian News Review No. 1724 (Regional West).	302 mtrs.		Do.	Do.
4.	Indian News Review No. 1725 and Indian News Review No. 1725 (Regional North).	302 mtrs.		Do.	Do.

[F. No. 315/5/81-F(P)]
SUKUMAR MANDAL, Desk Officer

पूर्ति और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय
(पुनर्वास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 2 नवम्बर, 1981

क्र० प्र० 3362—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 34 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, मुख्य बंदोबस्त प्रायुक्त इसके द्वारा प्रशासनिक व वित्तीय व्यवस्थाओं के अंतर्गत हरियाणा सरकार को हस्तान्तरित की गई फरीदाबाद में स्थित मुआवजा पूल की सभी सम्पत्तियों तथा भूमियों के निपटान के लिए, पुनर्वास विभाग हरियाणा सरकार के उप सचिव, उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन बनाए गए नियम 87, 88, 90 (1) (क), 90 (1) (ख) 90 (11), 90 (12) और 101 द्वारा प्रदत्त अपनी शक्तियों सीपने हैं।

[संख्या-1(14)/वि०सेल/75-एम०एम०-11 (क)]

MINISTRY OF SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION
(Department of Rehabilitation)

New Delhi, the 2nd November, 1981

S.O. 3362.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Chief Settlement Commissioner hereby delegates to the Deputy Secretary, Rehabilitation Department, Government of Haryana, exercising the powers of the Settlement Commissioner, his powers under rules 87, 88, 90(1)(a), 90(1)(b), 90(11), 90(12) and 101 framed under the said Act, for the purpose of disposal of all lands and properties in Faridabad forming part of the Compensation Pool, transferred to the Government of Haryana, under administrative and financial arrangements.

[No. 1(14)/Spl. Cell/75-SS. II(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 9 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3363.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 41) की धारा 34 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मुख्य बंदोबस्त आयुक्त इसके द्वारा पुनर्वास विभाग की अधिमूर्चना, संख्या-1 (22) बि०सैल/79-एस एस-0-II (बी), दिनांक 7 नवम्बर, 1981 द्वारा बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त किए गए उपायुक्त मथ गांवित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ को अपनी निम्नलिखित शक्तियां सौंपते हैं —

- (i) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 23 के अंतर्गत अपील सुनने की शक्तियां
- (ii) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 24 के अंतर्गत पुनरीक्षण अपील सुनने की शक्तियां ।

[संख्या 1 (22)/बि०सैल/79-एस०एस०-II(ग)]
गोविन्द जी मिश्र, मुख्य बंदोबस्त आयुक्त

New Delhi, the 9th November, 1981

S.O. 3363.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (2) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (Act No. 44 of 1954), the Chief Settlement Commissioner hereby delegates to the Deputy Commissioner, Union Territory, Chandigarh, appointed as Settlement Commissioner, vide this Department's Notification No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS. II(B), dated the 11th November, 1981, his following powers :—

- (i) Powers to hear appeals under section 23 of the said Act.
- (ii) Powers to hear revisions under Section 24 of the said Act.

[No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS.II.(C)]
G. J. MISRA, Chief Settlement Commissioner

नई दिल्ली, 7 नवम्बर, 1981

का.आ. 3364.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा, कार्यपालक मजिस्ट्रेट, संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ को कार्यपालक मजिस्ट्रेट के रूप में उनके अपने कार्यों के अतिरिक्त, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा अथवा उसके अधीन संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ में स्थित मूआवजा पूल की सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में सहायक बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के कार्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए, सहायक बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या-1 (22)/बि.सैल/79-एस एस -2(क)]

New Delhi, the 7th November, 1981

S.O. 3364.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints the Executive Magistrate, Union Territory, Chandigarh, as Assistant Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing, in addition to his own duties as Executive Magistrate, the functions assigned to such Assistant Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act, in respect of properties forming part of Compensation Pool within the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

[No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS. II(A)]

का. आ. 3365.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा, उपायुक्त, संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ को, उपायुक्त के रूप में उनके अपने कार्यों के अतिरिक्त, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा अथवा उसके अधीन, संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ में स्थित मूआवजा पूल की सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में, बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के कार्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए, बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ।

[संख्या-1(22)/विशेष सैल/79-एस.एस.-2 (ख)]

S.O. 3365.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints the Deputy Commissioner, Union Territory, Chandigarh, as Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing, in addition to his own duties as Deputy Commissioner, the functions assigned to such Settlement Commissioner, by or under the said Act, in respect of properties forming part of Compensation Pool within the Union Territory of Chandigarh.

[No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS II(B)]

का.आ. 3366.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा, गृह सचिव, संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ को गृह सचिव के रूप में उनके अपने कार्यों के अतिरिक्त, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा अथवा उसके अधीन संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ में स्थित मूआवजा पूल की सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में संयुक्त मुख्य बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के कार्यों का निष्पादन करने के लिए, संयुक्त मुख्य बंदोबस्त आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ।

[संख्या-1(22)/बि.सैल/79-एस.एस.-2 (घ)]

S.O. 3366.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints the Home Secretary, Union Territory, Chandigarh, as Joint Chief Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing, in addition to his own duties as Home Secretary, the functions assigned to such Joint Chief Settlement Commissioner, by or under the said Act, in respect of properties forming part of Compensation Pool within the Union Territory, Chandigarh.

[No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS. II. (D)]

का.आ. 3367.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 34 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा निवेश देती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 24 की उपधारा (4) तथा धारा 33 द्वारा प्रदोग की जाने वाली शक्तियां, चण्डीगढ़ में स्थित मूआवजा पूल की सम्पत्तियों के संबंध में गृह सचिव, संघ शासित क्षेत्र, चण्डीगढ़ द्वारा भी प्रयोग की जाएगी ।

[संख्या-1(22)/बि.सैल/79-एस एस -2 (ङ)]

एस. एस. बाधवानी, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3367.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby directs that the power exercisable by it under Sub-Section (4) of Sections 24 and 33 of the said Act, shall be exercisable also by the Home Secretary, Union Territory, Chandigarh, in addition to his own duties in respect of

the properties forming part of Compensation Pool within the Union Territory, Chandigarh.

[No. 1(22)/Spl. Cell/79-SS. II(E)]

N. M. WADHWANI, Under Secy.

श्रम मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 6 अक्टूबर, 1981

का० भा० 3368—इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद श्री बी० नीलावरी, राव, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद, आन्ध्रप्रदेश के समक्ष लंबित पड़े हैं ;

और श्री बी० नीलावरी राव की सेवाएं अब उपलब्ध नहीं रही हैं ।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33-ख की उपधारा (1) के साथ पठित धारा 7क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री के० सुब्बा राव होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त श्री नीलावरी राव, पीठासीन अधिकारी औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद के समक्ष लंबित उक्त विवाद से संबद्ध कार्यवाही को वापस लेती है और उसे श्री के सुब्बा राव, पीठासीन अधिकारी, औद्योगिक अधिकरण, हैदराबाद को इस निदेश के साथ स्थानान्तरित करती है कि उक्त अधिकरण आगे कार्यवाही उम प्रक्रम से करेगा, जिसपर वह उसे स्थानान्तरित की जाए तथा विधि के अनुसार उसका निपटान करेगा ।

अनुसूची

क्रमांक औद्योगिक विवाद	संदर्भ	पक्षकारों के नाम
1. औद्योगिक विवाद 1/78	आदेश सं० एल-12012/17/77-डी० 2 ए० तारीख 25-2-78	भारतीय स्टेट बैंक की सन्तोना-मल्ले शाखा के केशियर, श्री बी० श्रीरामुलु बनाम भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, हैदराबाद
2. औद्योगिक विवाद 2/78	आदेश सं० एल-12012/114/77-डी० 2(ए) दिनांक 20-3-78	स्टेट बैंक आफ हैदराबाद के हेड क्लर्क, श्री पी० विष्णुनाथन, बनाम स्टेट बैंक आफ हैदराबाद ।

[सं० एल-12012/114/77-डी० 2-ए०]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th October, 1981

S.O. 3368.—Whereas the Industrial disputes specified in the Schedule hereto annexed are pending before Shri V. Neeladri Rao, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh;

And Whereas the services of Shri V. Neeladri Rao are no longer available;

Now, Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A read with Sub-Section (1) of section 33B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal, the Presiding Officer of which shall be Shri K. Subba Rao with headquarters at Hyderabad and withdraws the proceedings in relation to the said disputes pending before the said Shri Neeladri Rao, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad and transfers the same to Shri K. Subba Rao, Presiding Officer, Industrial

Tribunal, Hyderabad with the direction that the same Tribunal shall proceed with the proceedings from the state at which they are transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	I.D. No.	Reference	P. rules to the dispute
1	2	3	4
1. I.D. 1/78	Order No. L-12012/17/77-D.II.A. dt. 25-2-78	Shri V. Sreeramulu, Cashier of Sattenapalle Branch of the State Bank of India V/s. State Bank of India, Hyderabad.	
2. I.D. 2/78	Order No. L-12012/114/77-D.II.A. dt. 20-3-78.	Shri P. Vishwanathan, Head Clerk, State Bank of Hyderabad V/s. State Bank of Hyderabad.	

[No. L-12012/114/77-D. II.A]

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3369.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Canara Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th November, 1981.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI S. R. VYAS (RTD.), PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

CAMP AT INDORE (M.P.)

CASE NO. CGIT/LC(R)/1980.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Canara Bank, Sanchi Branch, District Raisen (M.P.) and their workman, Shri M. G. Prakash Prabhu, C/o Shri M. L. Sabharwal, Vice President, M.P. Bank Karamachari Sangh, 30, Bakshi Gali Indore (M.P.)

APPEARANCES :

For Workman

Shri M. L. Sabharwal,

Vice President of the Union.

For Bank

Shri H. D. Sooda, Senior Manager,

Canara Bank, Siyaganj Branch,

Indore (M.P.)

INDUSTRY : Bank

DISTRICT : Indore (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated : October 31, 1981

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Government of India in the Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide Notification No. L-12012/162/79-D. II. A dated 1st October, 1980 :—

"Whether the action of the management of Canara Bank, Sanchi Branch, District Raisen (M.P.) in dispensing with the services of Shri M. G. Prakash Prabhu, Peon of Sanchi Branch of the said bank with effect from 16-8-1978 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. The dispute referred to for adjudication was regarding the justification of dispensing with the services of the workman, Shri M. G. Prakash Prabhu by the Sanchi Branch of the Canara Bank, District Raipur, with effect from 16-8-1978. After the notices were issued to the parties both the parties filed their pleadings and documents. However, during the course of the adjudication proceedings parties sought time for a mutual settlement and finally on 30-10-1981 a written settlement was filed by the parties. Terms and conditions set forth were read over to both the parties and all of them agreed that the dispute has been settled between them in accordance with the terms and conditions mentioned therein. According to the settlement the Bank has agreed to appoint the workman, Shri M.G. Prakash Prabhu, as a probationary peon at an early date but not later than 1-12-1981 at any of the branches to be mutually agreed on a basic pay of Rs. 245 per month plus Dearness Allowance and other allowances, payment of bonus will also be made to the workman for the actual days he had worked with the Bank. The terms and conditions are to the satisfaction of both the parties and appear to be a fair settlement of the dispute. It is, therefore, in the interest of both the parties that the settlement is accepted and an award is given in terms thereof.

3. Accordingly as agreed to between the parties the following is given :

1. That the Canara Bank will appoint Shri M.G. Prakash Prabhu as a Probationary Peon as early as possible but not later than 1-12-1981 at any of its branch on a monthly pay of Rs. 245 plus D. A and other allowances as admissible under the Bank Awards/Bipartite Settlement. The Bank shall thereafter confirm the workman in the Bank service as per rules.
2. The Canara Bank shall pay Bonus to Shri M. G. Prakash Prabhu for the days he actually worked in the Bank as per prevailing rules.

In view of the mutual settlement arrived at between the parties there will be no order as to costs.

31-10-1981, S. R. VYAS, Presiding Officer

[No. I-12012/162/79-D. II(A)]
N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

भारत सरकार

नई दिल्ली, 23 नवम्बर, 1981

का० आ० 3370—खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उप धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री स्वयं अधिकारी को मुख्य खान निरीक्षक के अधीन खान निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए-12025/2/80-खान-1]
श्री० गोविन्दराजन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 23rd November, 1981

S.O. 3370.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Swapn Adhikari as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. A-12025/2/80-M.I]
V. GOVINDARAJAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 24 नवम्बर, 81

का० आ० 3371.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार 16 अक्टूबर, 1981 GI/81-5

1981 से श्री हंसराज छाबड़ा को केन्द्रीय भविष्य निधि आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्ति अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० ए-12012/5/81-पी०एफ०]

संजीव दाता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3371.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5D of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby notifies the appointment of Shri Hans Raj Chhabra as the Central Provident Fund Commissioner, with effect from the 16th October, 1981.

[No. A. 12012(5)/81-PF I]
SANJIV DATTA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 24th November, 1981

S.O. 3372.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Godhur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th November, 1981.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 20/79

PRESENT:

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Godhur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Distt. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workman.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workman—Shri S. Bose, Genl. Secretary R.C.M.S.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

STATE: Bihar

Dated, the 14th November, 1981

AWARD

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them u/s 10(1)(d) the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has forwarded the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. I-20212/116/79-D.III(A) dated the 9th November, 1979.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workman of the management of Godhur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Kusunda, Dist. Dhanbad that Shri Inderdeo Saw should be allowed to resume duty as Waterman and paid full back wages in accordance with the provision of National Coal Wage Agreement for the period of idleness from April, 1977, is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The concerned workman Sri Inderdeo Saw claims to be a permanent worker of Godhur Colliery in the capacity of water mazdoor and it is stated that he has been carrying drinking water to various establishments of the management since April, 1975 and that in terms of National Coal Wage Agreement 1974 a water mazdoor has been placed in Category I and is entitled to get the wages at the rate of Rs. 10

per day plus other allowances. It is alleged that the concerned workman was paid a flat rate of Rs. 6 only per day. The workman made representation before the local management for higher wage but the management instead of making proper payment stopped him from service with effect from 1-4-1977 without assigning any reason. The workman then approached the union who represented the matter before the management by letter dated 2-5-1977, but to no effect. Thereafter the dispute was raised before the A.L.C. in August, 1978 and after the conciliation ended in failure the present reference was made. The concerned workman claims that he may be allowed to resume his duty in the post of waterman with full back wages and allowances for the idle period.

3. According to the management, however, the present reference is not legally maintainable as the concerned workman was never a workman of the colliery and no relationship of employer and employee existed between them. It is stated that the workman Sri Indradeo Saw was an independent person who used to supply water with the help of a Bhar to different persons. The management however asked him to supply 6 Bhars of water daily to the mess of Industrial Security Force Personnel for drinking purposes and used to be paid supplying 6 Bhars of water was one or two hours a day for rupee one per Bhar. It is stated that the time taken in which he used to be paid Rs. 6 per day. It is also submitted that the contract for supply of water was temporary and since permanent arrangement was made for supply of water to the Security Force by fitting water taps, there was no need to engage any one to supply water. It is also stated that the concerned workman refused to supply water at the instigation of interested persons and demanded wages for a time rated employee to which he was not entitled.

4. The further defence of the management is that the concerned workman was not an employee in the mine and as such the reference is outside the jurisdiction of this Court and is fit to be decided in favour of the management.

5. The point for consideration is as to whether the demand of the concerned workman that he should be allowed to resume duty as waterman and paid full back wages with effect from April, 1977 is justified. If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled.

6. The main issue raised on behalf of the management is as to whether the Central Government is the appropriate authority to refer this dispute and according to them reference can be made only if the concerned workman is a workman in a mine. The learned Advocate for the management has drawn my attention to the Section 2(a) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 which provides that the appropriate Government is the Central Government in respect of a mine. It is also urged by him that the concerned workman was not a workman in a mine and hence the reference is bad in law.

7. The workman WW-1 has admitted in his cross-examination that he was supplying water at the mess of the Central Industrial Security Force and at the residence of the Central Industrial Security Force personnel, and he used to supply water in the morning as also in the evening. No order of appointment was ever issued to him nor he was issued any identity card. According to Sri U.K. Jha, Sr. Personnel Officer who has examined himself on behalf of the management the concerned workman was supplying water to Industrial Security Force Personnel and he was never a workman of Godhur Colliery and the water was supplied on contract basis for which he was paid through cash book Ext. M-1. He has further stated that this arrangement for supplying water was temporary and since 1979 permanent arrangement in the shape of living water pipes have been made for supply of water to Industrial Security Force Personnel and there was no necessity to engage any person. Thus it is clear from the evidence of the workman as also the management that the concerned workman used to supply water to Central Industrial Security Force Personnel who are deputed to guard the industry. The question therefore, is as to whether the concerned workman will be deemed to be a workman or not. Under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 'mine' means a mine as defined in Clause (i) of Sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Mines Act, 1932. Under this definition a mine means any excavation where any operation for the purpose of searching for or obtaining minerals has been or is being carried on and includes any premises or part thereof on which any process ancillary to the getting, dressing or preparation for sale of minerals or of coke is being carried. According to the management, however the supply

of water to the Industrial Security Force Personnel does not come within the definition of the word 'mine' as the work which is incidental to or connected with mining operations must have some connection with or in relation to the mining operations themselves. It is therefore submitted that as the supply of water cannot be said to have any connection with the mining operation and hence the concerned workman cannot be held to be a workman employed in a mine. In support of his contention the learned Advocate for the management has cited before me the well known Sirajuddin case reported in Vol. 3, S.C.L.J. page 1800.

8. On a perusal of the above ruling and the evidence on record it is clear that the concerned workman cannot be held to be a workman in a mine and so the present reference is not maintainable as the Central Government cannot be said to be an appropriate authority to refer this dispute.

9. The learned Advocate for the workman, however, has filed before this Court an Arbitration Award Ext. W-2 along with the forwarding letter Ext. W-1 passed by the A.L.C. in the case of one Chhatradhari Gope who was workman of this very colliery in which it was held that Gope was a workman of Godhur Colliery, but the facts of that case is quite different and it is not applicable to the present case.

10. It was also urged on behalf of the workman that the Security Personnel resided in the premises situated in the locality of the mine and so the concerned workman should be deemed to be a workman in a mine. It was submitted by him that the definition of mine should be taken as is defined in the Coal Mines Nationalisation Act according to which the premises near the mine are also included in the definition of the mine. It is submitted on his behalf that the definition of mine as given in the Mine Act is not to be applied now in view of different definition given under the Coal Mines Nationalisation Act. But in my opinion this contention is not tenable. If the appropriate authority desired that the definition of mine as given in the Industrial Disputes Act should be changed then the appropriate amendment should have been made in the Act itself, but according to the Act the definition of mine is to be taken as it is defined under the Mines Act.

11. On the very face of the definition of term 'mine' it is clear that the concerned workman cannot be held to be a workman in a mine and hence the present reference is not maintainable.

12. It will also appear on the evidence on record the concerned workman cannot be said to be a workman because he was not working on full time basis and was a part time worker only because he used to supply water for a few hours only in the morning and in the evening. He was thus a part-time worker and cannot be said to be a workman under the Act.

13. Considering the evidence on record and facts and circumstances of the case, I hold that the demand of the concerned workman that he should be allowed to resume duty as waterman and paid full back wages with effect from April, 1977 is not justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

14. I give my award accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. I-20012/116/79-D.III(A)]

S.O. 3373.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Kustore, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th November, 1981.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 41 of 1980

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, At and Post Office Kustore, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.), Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri N. Nag, President, Akhil Bharatiya Shoshit Mazdoor Sangh.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, dated, the 10th November, 1981.

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(40)/80-D. III(A) dated 24th December, 1980, the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited. At and P.O. Kustore, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the schedule attached to the order referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal. The schedule to the order reads thus :

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, At and Post Office Kustore, District Dhanbad that the age of Shri Asakaran Singh, Overman for the purpose of continuing in service, should be amended as per the School Leaving Certificate or alternatively as per assessment made by a Medical Board after a reference to the Board for assessment of his age, is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workmen entitled?"

2. After notice to the parties they have filed their rewritten statements and rejoinders.

3. The case of the union as made out in its pleadings is as follows. Shri Asakaran Singh was an employee under the management since 4th February 1947. Till 30th July, 1979 there was no entry of the Birth date of the workman in the Form 'B' Register of Kustore Colliery. On 1st August, 1979 the management entered an incorrect date of birth in its record in respect of the workman and issued notice to him to stop work from 1st September, 1979. The entries in the records of the management regarding date of birth of the workman are imaginary and have no foundation. After issue of the notice Asakaran Singh produced school leaving certificate before the management in which his date of birth was mentioned as 30th January, 1925. In spite of this management did not refer the workman to any medical Board for ascertainment of his correct age and arbitrarily retired him. According to the age of the workman given in his school leaving certificate he was to retire in the year 1985. The premature retirement of the workman was therefore illegal and unjustified and so he is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages.

3. The case of the management as appears from its pleading may be briefly stated thus. The concerned workman was performing supervisory duty and was drawing salary of more than Rs. 500 per month. So he was not a workman and hence the reference is not maintainable. The concerned workman was holding a statutory post and was performing statutory duty in accordance with the provisions of Mines Act, 1952 and Rules and Regulations made thereunder. He had passed qualifying examinations qualifying him as a mining sirdar also as an overman and had been granted certificates by statutory authority. On his own declaration there has been mentioned of his age in the certificates. Therefore he is bound by his own declaration made before the competent authorities of the Mining Examination Board constituted under the Mines Act and the Coal Mines Regulations, 1957. The management had no right to amend or alter contents of the statutory certificates granted to the concerned workman. The workman was retired as per the age given in the certificates. The concerned workman after joining Kustore Colliery got his date of birth entered in Form 'B' Register as 1st August, 1919. The Form 'B' Register being prescribed under the Mines Rules, 1955 read with Section 48 of the Mines Act, it is obligatory on the part of the management to mention the sex and age of an em-

ployee in Col. 4 of the said register. An employee who makes a false declaration for the purpose of record in the Form 'B' Register is liable to be punished with imprisonment or fine under Section 64 of the Mines Act, 1952. It is the duty of the workman when Form 'B' Register is brought upto date to verify the details of the entries made therein and to put his signature or L.T.L. in the Register in token of his acceptance of the correctness of the entries made. Such being the position the relevant entry in Form 'B' Register showing the date of birth of the concerned workman has also signed the entry is to be presumed to be genuine until the contrary is established, particularly when the age tallies with the age as given in the certificates. The workman in the present case possesses an overman's certificate in which his date of birth has been given to be 1st August, 1919. This certificate is granted under clause (d) of sub-regulation (2) of regulation 12 by the Board of mining examination constituted under Regulation 11 of the Coal Mines Regulation 1957. Under the Regulation every application for overman's examination must be accompanied by a certificate of age in accordance with Reg. 15(X)(C)(i) of the Coal Mines Regulation 1957. That being so the particulars regarding age mentioned in overman's certificate has a presumptive value of correctness until contrary is proved. The concerned workman was appointed as overman under Regulation 34 of Coal Mines Regulation 1957. So he was a senior mine official in terms of the said regulation holding charge of a mining district. He was performing the duties prescribed under Regulation 43 of the Coal Mines Regulation 1947. In these circumstances the entries regarding date of birth of the concerned workman both in Form 'B' Register maintained by the management as well as in the overman's certificate must be held to be correct. Management is bound by the particulars recorded in the overman's certificate in pursuance to which the concerned workman was appointed as a senior mine official. If according to the workman the date of birth as given in the overman's certificate was incorrect it was for him to approach the mining examination Board presided over by the D.G.M.S., Government of India for necessary correction. He not having done so it is not open to him to say that the age as given in the overman's certificate should not be accepted and the age as mentioned in his school leaving certificate should be accepted for the purpose of retirement. The school leaving certificate relied upon by the concerned workman is a concocted document and therefore cannot be accepted. The said certificate was never produced by the workman before the A.L.C.(C), Dhanbad in the Conciliation proceeding. The age of the workman as mentioned in Form 'B' Register as well as in the overman's certificate being the same it was not necessary for the management to send the concerned workman to a medical board for ascertainment of his real age before retiring him. The policy of the management is to superannuate a workman on the basis of age recorded in statutory documents. In case of serious doubt it becomes necessary to determine the correct age either by referring to other document or to report of medical board. The first condition, therefore, must be that the age recorded in two statutory documents must be different which is not the case here. It is only when the age recorded in any other register of any Government department such as C.M.P.F. office is different from what is recorded in Form 'B' Register, the management permits the concerned workman to continue in his job till he retires on the basis of the date of birth advantageous to him provided he is medically fit. This policy was strictly followed by the management in the present case. The date of birth of the concerned workman recorded in C.M.P.F. record being 1st June, 1913 the workman was asked to retire on the basis of his age as mentioned in Form 'B' Register and the overman's certificate the same being more advantageous to him. In these circumstances the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

5. In course of hearing the union has examined two witnesses, namely, the concerned workman as WW-1 and another namely, Bajinath as WW-2. The workman in his deposition says as follows. He was reading in Akona School where he was admitted for the first time. The Head Master of the school is dead. He does not remember the date of birth. He had a horoscope showing the date of birth which had been stolen away alongwith other documents kept in a box in his house about 15 years back. He lodged an information about the theft before the police and mentioned specifically therein about his horoscope. He has not maintained a copy of F.I.R. The school leaving certificate is in handwriting of the Head Master and bears his signature marked Ext. W-1.

Ext. W-2 the Identity Card issued to him does not show his age. When he asked regarding the omission about his age he was told by the management that there was no mention about his age in Form 'B' Register and so the Identity Card was silent about it. When he was retired in 1979 he approached the Doctor of Kustore Colliery who gave him the certificate Ext. W-3 mentioning therein that he was born in 1925. Till he received the notice of retirement in August, 1979 he did not know as to whether Form 'B' Register contained his date of birth. After he received notice of retirement he made a representation to the management and the said representation was of no effect. All the particulars mentioned in mining sirdar's certificate Ext. M-1 of the concerned workman are correct except the particular about his age. He does not know if at the time of his admission in the school his date of birth was recorded in a register. His father brought his school certificate and that he did not accompany his father at that time. After his father brought the school certificate it was kept inside a box in an almirah. After he received notice of retirement he got this certificate after search. He accompanied his father to the school at the time of his admission but he did not go inside the office where his father went to get his son admitted. Therefore he is unable to say as to what date of birth was recorded in the school record by his father. He admits his signature in Form 'B' Register Ext. M-2. He did not read entries in Form B Register when he put his signature. The doctor who granted him medical certificate Ext. M-3 is still in service.

The other witness for the union WW-2 only says that he was present when the Identity Card was issued to the concerned workman and that when the concerned workman did not find any mention about his age in the identity card he made a verbal complaint before the management. The witness further says that he was all long present inside the court room when the concerned workman was being examined and cross-examined and that he had been brought to the court to depose in favour of the concerned workman.

5. The management has examined two witnesses of which MW-1 is working in D.G.M.S. office. He produces the overman's certificate of the concerned workman Ext. M-3 and deposes that according to Ext. M-3 the date of birth of the concerned workman is 1st August, 1919. He also proves the signature of the Chairman and of the Secretary on the certificate. In cross-examination he asserts that the age mentioned in the certificate is as per information given by the candidate.

MW-2 the other witness for the management proves the relevant entry in the Form 'B' Register relating to the concerned workman. According to him he, Motilal Paswan and R. K. Misra prepared the Form 'B' Register. He says that Motilal had written the entries in Cols. 2, 3, and 5 relating to the concerned workman. He is of course unable to say who has filled the Col. 4. He proves the signature of the concerned workman against the relevant entry in Col 9. The witness asserts that the concerned workman signed in Col 9 after all the entries were filled up. The witness however admits in his cross-examination that he was not present when the concerned workman signed Form 'B' Register but he says that he is acquainted with the signature of the concerned workman. To a question in cross-examination the witness admits that formerly management was only mentioning the years of birth of the workman and subsequently on instruction from the management to mention the date of birth of each workman in Form 'B' Register date of birth was mentioned. The witness further admits that at some places in Form 'B' Register the year of birth has been mentioned whereas at some other places date of birth has been mentioned.

6. From the pleadings of the parties and from the evidence adduced by them it appears that the concerned workman who joined service in 1947 was retired by the management in the year 1979 on the footing that his date of birth was 1st August, 1919 and that he completed his 60th year in August, 1979. According to the union the date of birth of the concerned workman as per the school leaving certificate being 30th January, 1925 he was to retire in the year 1985 and hence management's action in retiring him in 1979 is not justified. The management mainly relied upon the entries regarding the date of birth of the concerned workman made in Form 'B' Register Ext. M-2, mining sirdar's certificate Ext. M-1 and overman's certificate Ext. M-3. MW-2 has proved the entries in Form 'B' Register as well as the signature of

the concerned workman in Col. 9 of the entries. As against this the contention of the union is that when he signed Form 'B' Register he did not read the relevant entries. Further it is urged that when the concerned workman noticed that the identity card issued to him did not mention his age he made a verbal complaint the management and that on this complaint he was told that as Form B Register did not mention his age the identity card was silent about it. The identity card Ext. W-2 is silent about the age of the concerned workman. The case made out by the union regarding the correctness of the entry in the Form 'B' Register is sought to be supported by the evidence of the concerned workman WW-1 and by another witness WW-2. I have gone through the evidence of the two witnesses carefully and their evidence does not inspire any confidences so far as the verbal complaint is concerned. Merely because the identity card does not mention the age of the workman an attempt has been made to make out a case that there was no entry about age in the Form 'B' Register. There is nothing to disbelieve the evidence of MW-1 who says that he alongwith two others prepared the Form 'B' Register. According to this witness the workman himself signed the entry. The workman admits his signature but to avoid the entries comes forward with a story that he signed the entry without reading the same. It is very difficult to believe such a story specially when the concerned workman was not an ordinary labourer but was an overman. He does not say that when he signed the Form B Register all the columns had not been filled up or the column regarding the age was blank. In these circumstances I accept the case of the management that after all the columns in the Form B Register relating to the concerned workman were filled up the workman signed the same with full knowledge about the entries. True where the date of birth has been noted in Form B Register there is some correction but that correction is not regarding the date of birth. Therefore merely because there is some correction it cannot be said that the date of birth mentioned there is incorrect or was not there when the workman signed Form B Register. The entry in Form B Register is corroborated by two other documents, namely, mining sirdar's certificate Ext. M-1 and the overman's certificate Ext. M-3. In the mining sirdar's certificate Ext. M-1 the age of the workman has been put as 27 years in 1936. So according to this entry the year of birth of the concerned workman is 1919. The workman himself admits the correctness of entries in this document except the entry relating to his age. There is nothing to show why a wrong age should be given in this document. That apart under the Regulation and as per the evidence of MW-2 age in a mining sirdar's certificate is given as per information given by the candidate himself. The overman's certificate Ext. M-3 specifically mentions the date of birth of the concerned workman as 1st August, 1919. There is nothing to suggest that this entry is wrong. Exts. M-1 and M-3 are statutory documents issued by a statutory body. The evidence of MW-2 is, as mentioned above, that the age is mentioned in the overman's certificate as per information given by the candidate. True the Provident Fund record Ext. M-4 shows that the date of birth of the concerned workman is 1st June, 1913. This is also a Government record. As per policy mentioned in para 14 of the written statement of the management when the date of birth is found to be different in two different Government documents the employee is to be retired on the basis of that entry which is advantageous to him. Therefore when C.M.P.F. record Ext. M-4 shows that the date of birth of the concerned workman was 1st June, 1913 whereas Form B Register, mining sirdar's certificate and overman's certificate show that the date of birth of the concerned workman was 1st August, 1919 the management as per policy laid down in para 14 of the written statement retired the concerned workman on the basis of the entry to the effect that his date of birth is 1st August, 1919. The union of course has tried to falsify the entry in Ext. M-1, M-2 and M-4 by proving the school leaving certificate and medical certificate Exts. W-1 and W-3 respectively. Ext. W-3 is the medical certificate in which Doctor says that the date of birth is 30th January, 1925. Doctor has not been examined and moreover the certificate does not show to what tests the concerned workman was put before the Doctor opined that the date of birth of the concerned workman 30th January, 1925. Further it is impossible for a Doctor whatever be the tests he makes to say exactly the date of birth of a man. In these circumstances no reliance can be placed on the medical certificate Ext. W-3. Coming to the school leaving certificate Ext. W-1 the position is still worse for the union. The evidence of the concerned workman is that he did not himself accompany his father to the school office when his father got him

(workman) admitted into the school. The workman however says that he does not remember if his father carried any document to the school office when he went there to admit his son. Therefore the workman cannot say what was the basis for the entry in the school record regarding his age. The workman admits that he had a horoscope but takes a plea that the same has been stolen away 15 years back. He has deposed that he lodged F.I.R. regarding the theft where he mentioned about the loss of the horoscope. The copy of the F.I.R. is not produced to show as a matter of fact that the horoscope was stolen away. According to the evidence of the workman there were theft of documents only and of nothing else. This fantastic story cannot be accepted. The original register on the basis of which the school leaving certificate has been granted is not produced. Such being the position the entry in the school leaving certificate cannot be accepted in preference to the entry made in the mining sirdar's certificate and overman's certificate regarding the age of the concerned workman. The omission about the age in the identity card can be of no assistance to the union and on the basis of this omission it is difficult to hold that entry in Form B Register has been subsequently made when the said entry is supported by the two certificates, namely, mining sirdar's certificate and overman's certificate. On the aforesaid analysis the date of birth of the concerned workman is held to be 1st August, 1919 and so he had been rightly retired in August, 1979. Management does not press the point that the concerned workman not being a workman the reference is invalid.

For the reasons given above the demand of the union is not justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. There will be no orders for costs.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer
(No. L-20012/40/80-D. III(A))

S.O. 3574.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th November, 1981.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 4 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Jharia, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri B. Lal, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 16th November, 1981

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(52)/76-D.III(A), dated, 29-1-1981 the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the schedule attached to the order referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal. The Scheduled attached to the order reads thus :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad in dismissing Shri Laloo Singh, Night Guard Incharge of North Tisra Colliery with

effect from the 29th September, 1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. After notice to the parties they have filed their respective written statements and rejoinders. The dispute as appears from the schedule attached to the order of reference is regarding justifiability of the action of the management in dismissing Laloo Singh, the concerned workman with effect from 29-9-1975. It is not necessary to give in detail the case of the respective parties as appears from the pleadings since parties during the pendency of the reference case before the Tribunal have compromised and have prayed the Tribunal for passing an award in terms of the compromise. On 12-11-1981 parties filed compromise petition praying that the compromise be accepted and an award be passed accordingly. By order of that day it has been held that the compromise petition has been signed by the concerned parties and their respective lawyers, that the terms of the compromise are fair and reasonable and that parties accepted the terms. The Tribunal on that day ordered that the compromise be accepted and an award be passed according to terms thereof. The following award is, therefore, passed.

3. The concerned workman will be reinstated without wages but will be paid as ex-gratia payment for the period of idleness Rs. 500 for each completed eight months and he will be posted at North Tisra Colliery as Head Night Guard and will report for duty within two weeks from the date of compromise, namely, 12-11-1981 to the D.I.G. (Chief of Security) B.C.C.L. The workman will be paid leave with wages for the year 1980 and 1981. The period of idleness will be treated as continuity of employment for the purpose of gratuity/retranchment etc. as if he has completed 240 days attendance for the purpose of gratuity etc. only. The workman will have no other claim whatsoever. The reference is answered accordingly. There will be no order for cost. The compromise petition will form part of this award.

(No. L-20012 (52)/76-D.III(A))

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer.

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 1, DHANBAD.

Reference No. 4/81

Employers in relation to the management of DIG, BCCL (Chief of Security).

AND

Their workmen.

The humble petition of compromise by and between the workmen and the employer most respectfully sheweth.

1. That the parties have amicably settled the case outside the Court.

2. That the workman will be reinstated without wages but will be paid as ex-gratia payment for the period of idleness Rs. 500 (Rs. Five hundred for each completed eight months).

3. That the workmen will be paid leave with wages for the year 1980 in 1981.

4. That the period of idleness will be treated as continuity of employment for the purpose of gratuity/retranchment etc. as if he has completed 240 days attendance for the purpose of gratuity etc. only.

5. That the workmen will have no other claim whatsoever.

6. That the workmen will be posted at North Tisra Colliery as Head Night Guard and will report for duty within two weeks from the date hereof, to the DIG (Chief of Security) BCCL.

7. That it is prayed that the award may be passed in terms of the compromise and for which the party shall ever pray.

for the employer.

Sd/- Illegible.

Advocate Dy. P.M. B.C.C.L. Security (Hd. Qrs)
Vice President

Koyala Ispat Mazdoor Panchayat

Part of the Award.

New Delhi, the 27th November, 1981

S.O. 3375.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Religara Colliery of Central Coalfield Limited, Post Office Religara, District Hazaribagh and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 24th November, 1981.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 48/80

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Religara Colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Religara Dist. Hazaribagh.

AND

Their workman.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri T. P. Chowdhury, Advocate.

For the Workman—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : Bihar.

Dated, the 19th November, 1981

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/s 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-20012(234)/79-D. IIIA dated the 31st July, 1980.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workman of Religara Colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd., P. O. Religara, Dist. Hazaribagh that Shri Ramji Ram, Chargeman should be regularised as Electrical Foreman is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The case of the workman is that he was appointed as Electrical Helper in August, 1960 at Giddi 'C' colliery then owned and managed by M/s. National Coal Development Corporation (N. C. D. C.). He obtained his Matriculation Certificate in First Division but could not prosecute his higher studies and joined his duty as Electrical Helper with the hope of undergoing training and improving his status by virtue of hard labour and perseverance. It is stated that he hails from a backward caste of Hazaribagh District.

3. It is then alleged that he obtained his National Electrical Supervisor's Certificate of competency on 24-4-68 and thus became eligible to perform the statutory duties under Rule 45 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956. It is said that the management of Giddi 'C' colliery did not appoint him as Electrical Supervisor but put him as Electrician in Category V though work of Elect. Supervisor was taken from him from time to time. It is further stated that in the year 1973 the management directed the concerned workman to work as Elect. Supervisor in respect of electrically operated heavy earth moving machineries from 1-12-73 and so he was entitled to Grade A under the Wage Board recommendation with effect from 1-12-73, but he was not given as such. He was however designated as Chargeman and was paid Grade C with effect from 18-2-76. It is submitted that a Chargeman is equivalent to Electrical Foreman and is entitled to be placed in Grade B according to the Wage Board recommendations. It is also stated that several other employees have been put in Grade B & A but he has been victimised for his trade union activities. The concerned workman was transferred from Giddi C to Religara Colliery on 1-5-76 and there also he is performing the duties of Elect.

Supervisor and is entitled to be regularised as Elect. Foreman Incharge in Grade A but it is not being paid to him. He has, therefore, claimed that he is entitled to difference of wages under Grade A and Category VI from 1-12-73 till 1976 when he was designated as Chargeman and difference of wages in Grade A & C onwards.

4. The management has challenged the claim of the concerned workman and it is stated that the claim is baseless and unwarranted. It is stated that Religara Colliery is a taken over colliery which had no excavation section and after nationalisation it vested in the Central Division of the C.M.A. Ltd., which subsequently came to be known as Central Coalfields Ltd. At the time of vesting, N.C.D.C. was in existence and it was entrusted by the Central Govt. to take over this mine. The Religara Colliery was in conventional mine and after it was taken over by the N.C.D.C. it started an excavation section with deployment of heavy earth moving machinery in the pattern of some of the neighbouring mines in this area. In the N.C.D.C. set up there was no post of Elect. Supervisor as such and the supervisory set up consisted of Chargeman Gr. II, Chargeman Gr. I, Foreman and Foreman Incharge with a definite cadre scheme laying down the norms of promotion. Similarly the excavation section had its own hierarchy of Electricians, Chargemen, Foreman-in-charge one having nothing to do with the other. It is further stated that there was no provision for promotion of daily rated Electrician even when he was in Category 'C' to that of a Chargeman in the conventional mining-side but latter on such provision was made by the N.C.D.C.

5. It is the case of the management that the concerned workman was appointed as Elect. Helper in Category II on 16-8-60 and thereafter he was promoted to the post of Electrician in 1961 subject to the condition that he would produce statutory certificates required for the purpose, but as it was not filed he was reverted back to the post of Elect. Helper. Thereafter he was promoted to the post of Electrician on 3-5-70 and was given Category VI on 16-2-72. He was transferred to the open-cast mine of Religara Colliery on 1-12-73 and was promoted to the post of Chargeman from 18-2-76. It is alleged that the concerned workman had been making representation for change in his cadre from Electrical to Excavation and for re-designating him as Chargeman. It was conceded to by the management and he was redesignated as Chargeman with effect from the above date i.e. 18-2-76. According to the management under the rules of the company a Chargeman may be considered for promotion to the post of Foreman if he has two years experience and the case of the workman was considered by duly constituted Departmental Promotions Committee (D.P.C.) which met on 12-5-1977. But as the concerned workman had not even completed one year of experience as Chargeman he could not be recommended for promotion. According to the management promotion to Foreman is made by the D.P.C. and the certificate of Elect. Supervisor is not sufficient to give such promotion. Such authorisation is given under the Electricity Rules even to employees of lower categories also and there is no rule that whoever holds a Supervisorship certificate will automatically become a Foreman. It is admitted however that certain employees were given promotion but they were in different cadres and not in cadre of the concerned workman.

6. On the above grounds it is submitted that the claim of the concerned workman should be rejected.

7. The point for consideration is as to whether the demand of the concerned workman that he should be regularised as Elect. Foreman is justified and if so to what relief he is entitled.

8. On behalf of the workman only one witness viz. the concerned workman has been examined. He has also filed one document Ext. W-1 dated 2-7-77 which shows that on his prayer he was re-designated as chargeman excavation and was brought to this cadre from his original cadre of conventional mine. From the reference itself it will appear that there is no date from which the concerned workman claims to be regularised as Elect. Foreman but in his written statement he claims to be re-designated as Elect. Foreman with effect from 1-12-73 and is claiming the wages of Grade A. In fact he has got the promotion to the post of Elect. Foreman during the pendency of this reference and on that score he should have no grudge because in the reference no date as stated

above has been given as deadline from which date he should get promotion as Elect. Foreman.

9. The grade of Elect. Foreman is Grade B, but in this reference the concerned workman is claiming the grade of Foreman Incharge which is Grade A but there is no reference with respect to that.

10. It is therefore to be considered as to whether the concerned workman is entitled to Grade A as claimed by him because he has already got promotion to the post of Elect. Foreman which is his demand. It is not denied that the Religara colliery was under the management of N.C.D.C. The Coal Wage Board recommendation 1967 has dealt with the employees of the N.C.D.C. in Chapter VIII, page 60, Vol. I. At page 79 it has given different categories of Engineering and the Elect. Supervisor has now been designated as Foreman Incharge technical Grade A. It is not denied that there was no post of Elect. Supervisor in State Collieries which was taken over by the N.C.D.C. and the monthly rated employees of N.C.D.C., were governed by the Civil Service Rules or Railway Rules and they have got different hierarchy of supervisory staff. It is admitted by the workman himself in his evidence that in N. C. D. C. supervisory electrical post comprised of the following category :

- (a) Chargeman Grade II
- (b) Chargeman Grade I
- (c) Foreman and
- (d) Foreman Incharge

The Foreman Incharge was thus the highest post and above him was Engineer and higher authorities. These posts were filled up by promotions by duly constituted D. P. C. as and when vacancy arose and the promotion was subject to the posts available. The question however is as to whether an employee who possesses the Elect Supervisorship certificate under Rule 45 of the Electricity Rules is entitled to get grade A automatically without any promotion. It is not disputed that such authority is given by the management under the Mines Rules for installing any electrical installation and this authority is given even to a lower staff and simple authority is not sufficient to place any employee in Category A. There is nothing to show that the concerned workman was ever promoted as Elect. Supervisor or as Foreman Incharge and so the question of getting Category A does not arise at all. According to the management two years experience is required for promotion from chargeman to Foreman and in year 1977 D. P. C. was held for giving such promotion. But as the concerned workman had not completed two years experience as a Chargeman hence his case was not considered at that time and thereafter after completion of the statutory period when vacancy arose he was promoted as a Foreman. No doubt certain promotions have been made but it is in different cadre and the service book of those employees who have got such promotion have been filed by the management and they have been marked Ext. M series.

11. From the evidence of the concerned workman it simply appears that he was authorised to perform the duty of Elect. Supervisor under the Mines Rules but as stated earlier such authority can be given to any electrical staff of the colliery provided he possess the supervisory certificate. The service book of the concerned workman has also been filed which will indicate that he never got such a promotion and in such a case he is not entitled to get the wages of Category A. It will also appear that as there was no post of Elect. Supervisor in N. C. D. C., question of promoting the concerned workman to that post did not arise at all. He was in fact in conventional cadre and was subsequently taken in excavation cadre and was designated as Chargeman Electrical. He has got his promotion as Foreman in due course but on no account he can claim promotion as Foreman Incharge in Category A. Further the question of promotion is the function of the management and the Tribunal cannot force the management to give such promotion to the concerned workman or create any post for promotion. The concerned workman will be automatically considered for such a promotion as and when such post occurs and occasion arise for the same.

12. Considering the evidence on record, I hold that the demand of the workman to be regularised as a Electrical Foreman is not justified and he is not entitled to get the

wages of Category A (Foreman Incharge) as claimed by him. The concerned workman has already been promoted as Electrical Foreman and so he is not entitled to any relief.

13. I give my award accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(234)/79-D.III(A)]

S.O. 3376.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dobari Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 23rd November, 1981.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 3 of 1981

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I. D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Dobari Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Ltd, Post office Jharia, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri G. Prosad, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri B. Lal, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, 16th November, 1981

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-20012(216)/79-D.III.A dated the 16th January, 1981 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Dobari colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad that Shri Kashi Nath Singh, Loading Superintendent should be reinstated in his job alongwith full back wages from the 9th March, 1978 is justified ? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled ?"

2. The facts of this case are more or less admitted. Shri Kashi Nath Singh, the concerned workman was on permanent roll of Dobari colliery since 1-9-71 and his Provident Fund Account No. is C/405244. The workman went on leave from 27-1-73 to 22-2-73. According to the workman he applied for extension of leave due to prolonged illness from time to time. It is said that he was suffering from T. B. The workman's case is that on being cured he reported for duty on 9-3-78 with fitness certificate of Doctor who treated him. He put in his application for permission to join his duties. He was not allowed to resume his duties since 9-3-78.

3. The case of the management is that Shri Kashi Nath Singh went on leave on 21-1-73. to 21-2-73, but he did not report for duty on 21-2-73. He did not indicate about this illness and did not apply for further leave. The case of the management is that the workman lost his lien on his job as provided under para 10(e) of Model Standing Order applicable to and bound on the employer and the employees. He reported for duty on 9-3-78 and was offered to be kept on badli list which was not acceptable to him. The further case

of the management is that since the workman concerned overstayed for 5 years without leave, information or permission the inference was drawn by the management that the concerned workman had abandoned his job.

4. The management also pleaded that the reference is not maintainable for the reason that an industrial dispute was raised and the Government of India refused to refer the case for adjudication at the first instance and then referred the case for adjudication to this Tribunal.

5. I will take up first the question of maintainability of this reference. It has been argued before me that the Central Government by letter No. 20012/216/79/D.III dated 17-12-79 decided not to refer this dispute for adjudication. But subsequently by order No. L-20012/216/79-D.III.A dated 16-1-81 this dispute was referred. Reliance has been placed on AIR-1970 SC page 150 to show that the action of the Central Government in referring this dispute for adjudication is against the principle of natural justice. Some judgements of the Madras High Court and Calcutta High Court have also been referred to in support of the same point. But even Shri G. Prosad Advocate for the management has conceded that the function of the Government of India in making a reference is primarily administrative and no bar can be put on the powers of the Government of India to make the reference if the earlier order is revised. Unfortunately, in this case we have not got any material to show under what circumstances the earlier order of the Government of India not to refer the matter in dispute for adjudication was revised. The management's contention is that no indication was made by the Government of India to the management giving any reason for referring this dispute for adjudication. We can at best say that under circumstances of this case, there had been some irregularities committed inasmuch as the parties were not given any opportunity by the Government of India to discuss this case before the earlier order was revised. But this does not take away the over-all powers of the Government of India to make a reference after once having rejected it. In this view of the matter, the action of the Government of India in referring this dispute cannot be said to be unlawful. I have, therefore, to hold that the reference is maintainable.

6. The case of the management hinges on the point as to whether the concerned workman lost his lien on his job by virtue of operation of clause 10(e) of the Model Standing Order. The concerned workman has given his evidence as WW-1. According to him he went on leave on 27-1-73 upto 20-2-73. He fell ill and it was found that he was suffering from T.B. He sent one application for leave for one month, but as he was not cured he applied for further extension of leave by registered post. The colliery management did not inform him as to what order was passed on his application for leave. When he approached for joining the post on 9-3-78 he was informed that his name had been struck off from the roll of the colliery. He proved two postal acknowledgements in respect of registered letters of leave which are Exts. W. 1 and 2.

7. The management on the other hand examined MW-1 Shri R. P. Agarwal who was manager of Dohari colliery from 20-4-73 to 20-7-73. He has deposed that he did not know the concerned workman, Shri Kashi Nath Singh. He could not also say whether he had gone on leave. He has proved a Man Power list, Ext. M3 sent by Shri S. Prosad, Custodian. He has admitted that this list contained the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh. In this list S. No. 27 containing the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh has been encircled in red ink by this court. The witness has said that he pened through the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh under Sl. No. 27, because he was not present. In his cross-examination he has admitted that while pening through the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh he did not initial or give any date. He made no endorsement on this list that he had pened through the name his name. He did not remember whether he prepared a separate memo incorporating the fact that since Shri Kashi Nath Singh was absent he deleted his name. He has admitted that the Custodian had sent the list, Ext. M3 to him for the purpose of verification. The witness did not remember whether he had sent any verification report. He further admitted that he did not communicate to Shri Kashi Nath Singh that his name was struck off from the roll of the colliery.

8. The other witness for the management is MW-2, Shri B.M. Vaidwaj, a senior Personnel Officer of Dohari Colliery since 24th April, 1974. He has proved 2 Form B registers, Exts. M4 and Ext. M5 in order to show that they do not contain the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh. In his cross-examination he has said that Exts. M4 started from December 1974 and Ext. M5 started on subsequent date. He admitted that prior to 1974 there were form B registers of the colliery, but the same had been seized by the Custodian. He has further admitted that Exts. M4 and Ext. M5 were not prepared on the basis of the earlier Form B registers.

9. It will appear that the evidence of MW-2 is of no use for the purpose of this case. Similarly, Exts. M4 and Ext. M5 are not useful for our discussion because they were not prepared on the basis of the earlier Form B registers which admittedly were in existence prior to these registers. MW-1 has admitted that he received a Man Power list from the Custodian containing the name of Shri Kashi Nath Singh, under Sl. No. 27 of Ext. M3. He did not find Shri Kashi Nath Singh present and therefore he deleted his name. Obviously, the only reason for him to delete his name was on the ground that he was not present. He had no idea as to whether Shri Kashi Nath Singh was on leave. The management has not adduced any evidence to show that any decision was taken in view of clause 10(e) of the Model Standing Order. In fact, no communication whatsoever was made to the concerned workman. The position of law is very clear—a continued absence for more than 10 days amounts to misconduct under the standing order and on that ground a charge-sheet could be levelled against the concerned workman and he could have been dismissed on the basis of that charge. This was not done. Then again under clause 10(e) of Model Standing Order a decision could have been taken by the management to struck off his name for continued absence without leave or permission, but in that case the concerned workman could have been placed in the badli list. But even in this connection an information should have been given to him about the action taken by the management. The position of law is that in absence of the aforesaid two courses of action, the striking off the name of the concerned workman would amount to retrenchment. But for the purpose of retrenchment it is necessary to adopt the provision of S. 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947. The concerned workman was a permanent employee who worked for more than 2 years before he went on leave. It is necessary to give him one month's notice in writing indicating the reasons for retrenchment and the workman must have been paid 1 month's wages in lieu of notice. None of these things have been done. It will therefore appear that on facts as it stands, clause 10(e) of the Model Standing Order does not come into play and this appears to be a case of retrenchment without following the provisions of S. 25F of the I.D. Act.

10. Shri G. Prosad, Advocate for the management has referred to several decision, but all those cases relate to continued absence of a workman in whose case the management have taken positive decision. This is not so in this case. I need not quote them all because they are not applicable to the facts of this case.

11. Shri G. Prosad, Advocate has also argued about 'abandonment' of the job by the concerned workman. I do not think this expression occurs in any of the standing orders and so this term 'abandonment' is not a legal concept. Suffice it to say that so far as the workman is concerned, he could be either dismissed or his lien could be terminated by virtue of the provisions of the standing order. He could be retrenched for the reason of continued absence after following the provisions of S. 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947. But for all these courses open to the management certain procedure had to be adopted by the management as enjoined by the Model Standing Order and the I.D. Act, 1947. The position is that the concerned workman has not been dismissed nor retrenched, nor his lien has been terminated. The natural conclusion therefore is that he continues in the services of the colliery.

12. Thus, having considered all aspects of this case, I have to hold that the demand of the workmen of Dohari colliery of Messrs Bhaat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office

Jharia District Dhanbad that Shri Kashi Nath Singh, Loading Superintendent should be reinstated in his job along with full back wages from the 9th March, 1978 is justified. Consequently, Shri Kashi Nath Singh, Loading Superintendent is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and other emoluments with effect from 9th March, 1978.

This is my award.

Sd/-

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad.
[No. J-20012(216)/79-D.II(A)]
A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 26th November, 1981

S.O. 3377.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Beas Sutlej Link Project and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th November, 1981.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 103 of 1978

In re :

The President, B. S. L. Workers' Union,
Sundernagar Township,
Himachal Pradesh.—Petitioner.

Versus

The Chief Engineer,
Beas Sutlej Link Project,
Sundernagar Township,
Himachal Pradesh.—Respondent.

PRESENT :

Shri M. S. Toggar—for the workman.
Shri Narinder Singh—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-42012(13)/78-D.II(B) dated the 22nd November, 1978 referred an Industrial Dispute to this Tribunal in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of the Beas Sutlej Link Project, Sundernagar Township in dismissing Shri Leel Bahadur, Token No. 371-AJ with effect from the 31st July, 1976 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and notices were sent to the parties. A statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman. Thereafter a written statement was filed and finally a replication was filed. Later on an application for amendment of the written statement was filed which was allowed subject to payment of costs and amended written statement was filed. Then a replication was filed and on the pleadings of the parties following two issues were framed :

1. Whether the reference is bad for the grounds detailed in para 1 of written statement?

2. As in the order of reference?

3. The evidence of the parties was recorded arguments were heard. I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and have given my considered thought to the matter before me and I have come to the following findings :
993 GI/81-6

ISSUE NO. 1 :

4. The representative of the Management came forward with a statement on 25th April, 1981 in the following terms :

Statement of Shri Narinder Singh on S.A.

I give up issue No. 1 in view of the fact that case is governed by Section 2-A of the I.D. Act.

In these circumstances issue No. 1 is decided in favour of the workman and against the Management.

5. ISSUE NO. 2 :

From the statement of claim I find that it is contended therein that Leel Bahadur, workman was working under Executive Engineer, Power Plant Construction Division, B. S. L. Project, Sundernagar; that his employer served a charge sheet dated 22-8-1975 upon the workman and he was placed under suspension; that the Sub-Divisional Officer Field Division as Enquiry Officer directed the workman to submit his defence vide letter dated 9-1-76; that the workman had requested the Enquiry Officer to enable him to be represented by a representative but the said request was disallowed; that there was a practice to call Labour Welfare Officer and a representative of the recognised union to watch the interest of the workman at the time of enquiry but the same was not done in the instant case; that thereafter the Executive Engineer Power Plant Construction Division served letter dated 4-6-74 asking the workman to show cause; that the workman vide his letter dated 7-6-76 requested him to supply certain documents and upon the failing of the respondent to supply those documents he had no alternative but to submit his reply to the show cause notice; that the service of the workman were dismissed vide letter dated 31-7-76; that the appeal of the workman was also dismissed by the Appellate Authority without applying his mind; that the termination is therefore illegal

6. In its reply the Management while admitting the employment of the workman and the service of charge sheet, suspension, enquiry and ultimate dismissal and the rejection of the appeal has denied other allegations of the workman and has stated that the enquiry was held properly and a full opportunity was given to the workman and it is reiterated that the termination was valid.

7. In order to establish his contention the workman has come forward himself as W.W. 1 and proved his affidavit Ex. W/1 and also tendered documents into evidence Annexures A to K. I have perused Ex. W/1, affidavit of the workman and from the perusal thereof I find that it is practically the reiteration of his allegations in the statement of claim. During cross examination it is admitted by him indirectly that standing orders had been modified. During cross examination he has produced Ex. W/2, the receipt of his membership of union. It is further admitted by him during cross-examination that he received the charge sheet. It is further admitted by him that the enquiry was held but it is denied by him that all his witnesses were examined or that he was offered full opportunity or that he was represented by one Shri D. K. Banerjee in the enquiry. It is similarly admitted by him that he was issued show cause notice and was given personal hearing and the Executive Engineer had called him to explain after the enquiry was over and he was punished and he had preferred an appeal to Supdtg. Engineer which was also dismissed. One very important admission made by him during cross examination is that Shri Toggar had represented him in the enquiry and Shri Banerjee had also represented him and that he had also been signing the enquiry proceedings. Shri Toggar is the same person who is representing this workman before this Tribunal. He has been examined as W.W. 2 in his statement as W.W. 2 he has tendered his affidavit Ex. W/3 but this affidavit is primarily concerned with the espousal of the case which was subject matter of issue No. 1 which has already been decided in favour of the workman. Shri Toggar has not stated anything on the merits of the case beyond that. He has in his affidavit Ex. W/3 stated that he was President of the BSL Workers' Union.

8. As against this evidence of the workman the Management has examined Shri O. P. Verma, Executive Engineer as M.W. 1. M.W. 1 has submitted his affidavit Ex. M/1 in which he has stated that he was Incharge (Personnel) and as such was fully familiar and conversant with the records

of this case. He has further stated in the affidavit that Leel Bahadur, workman while employed as Beldar was deputed to guard the store and he was charge sheeted by the competent authority for mis-conduct and was dealt with Departmentally under the certified standing orders for non-factory staff applicable on the Project and he was charge sheeted vide letter dated 22-8-75 of the Executive Engineer which is Ex. R/1 and reply Ex. R/2 was filed by the workman and the punishing authority after considering the reply appointed the Enquiry Officer vide order dated 26-12-75, copy Ex. R/3 and the enquiry was held by the Enquiry Officer. Copy of the enquiry proceeding is Ex. R/4 and he submitted his report Ex. R/5 and after considering the report a show cause was issued by the punishing authority vide letter dated 4-6-76, copy Ex. R/6 and reply Ex. R/7 to the said show cause notice was filed by the workman and thereupon the Executive Engineer sent a letter dated 28-7-76, copy Ex. R/8 to the workman and finally passed the dismissal order, copy Ex. R/9 on 31-7-76. It is also stated by him that Shri Leel Bahadur appealed against the punishment order and the said appeal was dismissed. He has filed copies Ex. R/10 and Ex. R/11 in respect thereof. This witness has been cross examined at length by the workman side but nothing has been brought out to belie his statement in chief. I have perused the enquiry proceedings and I do not find anything to even to remotely suggest that the enquiry was not held in accordance with the principles of natural justice and the standing orders applicable to the workman. From the perusal of Ex. R/4, the enquiry proceedings I find that it is duly signed by the workman at appropriate place in token of its correctness. From the perusal of Ex. R/5, the report of the Enquiry Officer I find that the Enquiry Officer has considered the matter in a right perspective and in an unbiased manner. There is nothing to suggest that his conclusions are perverse or that he had mis-directed himself or the enquiry. He has found Leel Bahadur guilty of charges levelled against him. Ex. R/6 show cause notice is also detailed and it cannot be said that anything has been withheld by him or that the workman had not understood true import of charge and suggested action against him. Perusal of R/7 and Ex. R/8 show that the request of the workman was duly allowed at that stage even and it was thereafter that his reply to show cause notice was considered and order of dismissal dated 31-7-76, copy Ex. R/9 was passed. Ex. R/10 is the copy of appeal and Ex. R/11 is the order of appellate authority. From the perusal of Ex. R-1 I find that the defence counsel was also present alongwith appellant at the time of hearing of the appeal. Accumulative effect of a perusal of documents Ex. R/1 to Ex. R/11 goes to show that the workman has failed to establish that the enquiry was not properly held against this workman or that enquiry was vitiated. It also cannot be said that the workman had not been afforded full opportunity to represent his case before the Enquiry Officer. It has been urged that the charges against the workman are vague but from the perusal of charge sheet it cannot be said that the charges are vague. It also cannot be said that the workman was misled by these charges or that the conclusions of the Enquiry Officer were perverse. It may be mentioned here that this court would not sit as an appellate authority against the Enquiry Officer as long as the conclusions arrived at by the Enquiry Officer are not perverse. It has also not been shown that the Punishing Authority was not competent to pass the order of termination or that the Enquiry Officer had not been properly appointed. Annexures A to K filed by the workman are copies of some of the documents Ex. R/1 to Ex. R/11 which have already been discussed in detail. In view of my discussions above, I held that the workman has failed to establish that the enquiry is vitiated and in consequence it follows that the order of termination of services of the workman Shri Leel Bahadur is not liable to be set aside and accordingly it is awarded that the action of the Management of the Beas Sutlej Link Project, Sundernagar Township in dismissing Shri Leel Bahadur, token No. 371-AJ w.e.f. 31st July, 1976 is justified and he is not entitled to any relief what-so-ever. However parties are left to bear their own costs.

Dated : the 2nd September, 1981.

Further ordered :

That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at their end.

Dated : the 2nd September, 1981.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-42012(13)/78-D.II.B]

S.O. 3378.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Western Railway Kota and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th November, 1981.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 74 of 1978

In re :

The Divl. Secretary, Pabchim Railway Karamchhari Parishad, Opp. Hatssthal, Station Road, Kota-324002.

...Petitioner

Versus

The Divisional Superintendent, Western Railway, Kota-324002.

...Respondent.

AWARD

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. vide its order No L-41012(3)/77-D. II(B) dated the 18th August, 1981 referred an Industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act to this Tribunal in the following terms :

'Whether the action of the Divisional Superintendent, Western Railway, Kota in terminating the services of Shri Mohammed Hussain, son of Shri Abdul Rahim, Box Boy under the Station Master, Kota, with effect from the 28th April, 1973 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled ?'

2. On receipt of this reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties. In pursuance of the said notice a statement of claim was filed by the workman and then a written statement was filed by the railway and finally a replication was filed by the workman. Upon the pleadings of the parties following issues were framed vide my order dated 19-6-81 :

ISSUES :

1. Whether the enquiry is vitiated ?
2. As in the order of reference ?

3. Then the case was adjourned for evidence of the workman to 14-8-81 at Udaipur. Due to certain contingencies this date was changed from 14th August to 22nd August, 1981 and the parties were intimated accordingly. On 22nd August, 1981 none appeared for the Management side at Udaipur while the workman appeared with Shri R. C. Singhal. Affidavit was filed on behalf of the workman and case was adjourned for cross-examination to 19th October, 1981 at Delhi. On 19th October, 1981 again none appeared for the Management while Shri A. D. Grover appeared for the workman. In view thereof ex-parte was ordered against the railway and ex-parte evidence was recorded which consists of statement of workman on affidavit Ex. W/1 apart from documents Ex. W/2 to Ex. W/8.

4. I have gone through the evidence referred to above and have heard Shri A. D. Grover and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings upon these issues :

ISSUE No. 1.

5. The contention of the workman as disclosed from claim statement of his statement in chief is that he was originally working as a substitute w.e.f. 31-6-60 and was absorbed in regular vacancy as a khalasi/box boy w.e.f. 1-10-66 and his services were terminated in June, 1973 without due process of law and proper enquiry and as such it is urged by the workman that the enquiry was vitiated and the termination was invalid.

6. From the perusal of affidavit Ex. W/1 I find that the contention of the workman is established beyond all shadow of doubt. The fact that this workman was initially working as substitute w.e.f. 21-6-60 is admitted in para no. 1 of the written statement to be correct. Similarly the fact that this workman was absorbed in regular vacancy is also admitted in para 2 of the written statement to be correct. Similarly the fact that this workman was absorbed in regular vacancy is also admitted in para 2 of the written statement. The fact that he was sent a charge sheet to a wrong address namely 'Shri Mohd. Hussain, Box Boy, Railway Quarter No. 1079, Railway Colony, Kota' is not denied. It is also not denied that the said notice was not served upon the workman and rather was received back. Reference in this behalf may be made to para 3 of the written statement. The contention of the Management in this behalf is that the workman was addressed this notice to his last known address but the workman has stated on affidavit that his address from the beginning had been quarter No. 107-G, Railway Colony, Kota and therefore it is established that the notice was sent to a wrong address. In as much as in paras 5 to 15 are not substantially denied by the Management, it is deemed to have been established by the workman that all these notices and letters were addressed to him but at a wrong address. With the result that these could not be served upon the workman. The contention of the Management has been that these were sent to his last known address. I have also observed that the workman has stated that his address was with the authorities from the beginning and hence it would follow that all these letters were addressed to the workman on a wrong address and as such were not served upon the workman and have not reached to the workman and conclusively it would follow that any enquiry held against the workman on the basis of these letters having been deemed to have been served upon the workman cannot be sustained. If the workman is not served with a charge sheet or notice of enquiry or date of hearing of the enquiry it is difficult to believe that any proper enquiry was held against the workman. I have perused documents Ex. W/2 to W/8 which are these letters addressed to the workman which also show that these were addressed to a wrong address and were not delivered to the workman and were received back undelivered. The contention of the workman is that the only letter served upon him and that too, on the address 107-G Railway Colony, Kota was the notice calling upon him to show cause against proposed penalty which is referred to in para 16 of the statement of claim. In para 16 of the written statement the Management has not explained as to how the Management had come to know of this address of the workman. This would only show that the Management had all along been knowing the address 107-G, Railway Colony, Kota and therefore it would follow that the enquiry is vitiated for non-compliance with the principles of natural justice and also for requirements of the rules laid down for enquiries in respect of railway servants. In para 17 to 22 of statement of claim show that the workman preferred first appeal, a second appeal and a revision against this order of punishment of termination of his services all of which were rejected by the appropriate authorities. From these paras it is also established that all along the workman had been contending that neither any charge sheet nor any enquiry notice have been served upon him but no weight had been given by any of the authorities. The affidavit of the workman stands un-rebutted, on the case. From whichever angle I may consider the matter before me I have come to the conclusion that the enquiry and the findings of the enquiry and the punishment imposed in consequence thereof cannot be sustained and they are all vitiated and accordingly this issue is decided in favour of the workman and against the Management.

ISSUE No. 2.

7. In view of my findings upon issue No. 1 above, it follows that the order of termination is not valid. Once it is held that the order of termination was not valid it would follow that the workman would be entitled to reinstatement with full back wages. I have perused the entire written statement and from the perusal thereof I find that it is no where requested by the Management that in case this Tribunal comes to a conclusion that the enquiry was vitiated it may hold the enquiry afresh. It is also not alleged in the written statement that the workman was gainfully engaged during the period after termination of his services. In view thereof it is awarded that the enquiry is vitiated and consequently the order of termination of the services of this workman is also vitiated and cannot be sustained and the enquiry is set aside and the workman is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages. He will be entitled to costs of this litigation which is assessed at Rs. 250/-.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

Dated : the 2nd November, 1981.

11th Kartika, 1903.

Further ordered :

That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Sd/-

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

Dated : the 2nd November, 1981.

11th Kartika, 1903.

[No. I-41012(3)/77-D.II.B]

S.O. 3379.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relations to the management of the Beas Sutlej Link Project and their workers, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th November, 1981.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL—CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI.

I.D. No. 19 of 1979

In re :

The President, Beas Sutlej Link Workers' Union, Sundernagar Township, Himachal Pradesh. ...Petitioner.

Versus

The Chief Engineer, B.S.L. Project, Sundernagar Township Himachal Pradesh. ...Respondent.

AWARD

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. vide its order No. I-12012(1)/79-D. II(B) dated the 24th April, 1979 referred an Industrial Dispute to the Tribunal u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the following terms :

Whether the action of the management of Beas Sutlej Link Project in retrenching Shri Kishan Chand, General Fitter (Token No. 213-J) on 20-8-1977 without counting his past service rendered with the Bhakra-Dam Project (now known as Bhakra Beas Management Board) for purposes of seniority as per the orders of the Government of Punjab, is lawful and justified. If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. On receipt of the reference usual notices were sent to the parties and a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman. Thereafter a written statement and a replication were filed and upon the pleadings of the parties following two issues were framed :

1. Is the workman estopped from raising the dispute on the ground that the workman had never challenged

his seniority ?

2. As in the order of reference ?

3. Thereafter the case was adjourned for evidence of the parties. Evidence of the parties consists of statement of workman as W.W. 1 and statement of Shri R. L. Dogra, M.W. 1.

4. I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and have given my considered thought to the matter before me and I have come to the following findings on these issues.

5. ISSUE NO. 2 :

I would first take up this issue in the first instance. From the perusal of statement of claim filed by the workman I find that the contention of the workman is that the workman was appointed at Bhakra Dam Project as Fitter and was promoted as Fitter (General) w.e.f. 10-1-1958; that the BSL Project authority offered the workman alternative appointment when he was working at Bhakra Dam and the workman accepted the same and resumed his duty with BSL w.e.f. 12-6-67; that the Govt. of Punjab had issued instructions vide their circular No. 7402/BP/73/61 dated 4-8-61 which inter alia laid that seniority of workman on the Bhakra Project would take in consideration their services at Bhakra; that the Management of BSL retrenched the workman on 20-8-77 without compliance with the instructions dated 4-8-61 of Govt. of Punjab and the representation against this filed by the workman was rejected and hence this reference.

6. In its written statement the fact that the workman was previously with Bhakra Dam as fitter and fitter (General) are not denied. Similarly the fact that he was offered alternative appointment by BSL authority which the workman joined on 12-6-67 are not denied but the instructions of Punjab Govt. are denied and finally it is submitted that the BSL authorities wanted to give benefit of service rendered at Bhakra Dam Project to workers who come on alternative appointment to join BSL in the same category and trade in which they were working at Bhakra Dam Project and Shri Kishan Chand did not furnish requisite information and therefore his seniority was fixed w.e.f. 16-6-67 and on phased completion of the Project the BSL started retrenchment in 1976 and in course of time Shri Kishan Chand workman was also retrenched on his turn w.e.f. 20-8-77 after he was paid retrenchment compensation without raising any dispute whatsoever and as such the workman was not entitled to any relief whatsoever.

7. In order to prove his contention the workman has appeared as W.W. 1 and has tendered his affidavit Ex. W.W. 1/1 apart from documents on record which are Ex. W/1 to Ex. W/6. From the perusal of affidavit Ex. W.W. 1/1 of the workman I find that it is stated by him that he was appointed as General Fitter at Bhakra Dam on 10-1-1958 and he was offered alternative appointment by the BSL authority which he joined on 12-6-67 in the same trade and category and that his services were terminated by way of retrenchment w.e.f. 20-8-77 without taking into account his earlier service with Bhakra Dam Project and in violation of instructions issued by the Governor of Punjab.

8. I have already observed above that in its written statement the Management has admitted the correctness of para 1 of the application which shows that it is admitted by the Management that this workman was working as fitter (general) with the Bhakra Dam Project. Similarly para 2 of statement of claim is also admitted to be correct in the written statement which shows that this fact is also established that this workman while working as General Fitter with the Bhakra Dam Project was offered an alternative appointment by the BSL Project Authority and this workman accepted that offer and in consequence joined the service of BSL w.e.f. 12-6-67. In para 4 of its written statement it is conceded by the Management that BSL authorities wanted to give benefit of service rendered at Bhakra Dam Project to workers who come on alternative appointment to join BSL in the same category and trade in which they were working at Bhakra Dam Project. From the perusal of affidavit of Shri R. L. Dogra filed on behalf of the Management it is found that in para 1 of his affi-

davit Ex. M.W. 1/1 it is admitted by Mr. Dogra that Kishan Chand, workman was employed at BSL Project w.e.f. 16-6-67 as fitter (general). That being the position it is clearly established on record that this workman was working as fitter (general) with Bhakra Dam Project when he was offered alternative appointment by the Management of BSL and the workman joined BSL as fitter (general) i.e. in the same trade and category. That being the position this workman on the very admission of the Management in para 4 of its written statement was entitled to get his seniority from the date this workman became fitter (general) in the Bhakra Dam Project i.e. 10-1-1958 as given in para 1 of the statement of claim. The services of this workman were retrenched because his seniority was taken as 12-6-67 rather than 10-1-1958 and obviously if his seniority had been taken as 10-1-1958 he would not have been liable for retrenchment. Therefore it follows that he was retrenched at a time when retrenchment was not due and consequently it cannot be said that the retrenchment is valid and I hold accordingly.

7. Ex. M/2 is the discharge certificate filed by the Management which shows the trade of this workman in the Bhakra Dam Project as fitter 'G' and date of enrolment as 10-1-1958 and date of discharge as 12-2-67. 12-2-67 is the same date on which he joined as fitter (general) with the respondent. The reasons of discharge given there is 'Offered alternative appointment'. This document therefore also establishes the contention of the workman. Ex. W/1 is the copy of order dated 4-8-61 of the Punjab Govt. Para 4 whereof categorically shows that 'seniority of the workman on the Beas Project would take into consideration from service at Bhakra.' Service book of the workman has been filed by the Management and it is Ex. M/3. From the perusal of page 3 of this service book I find that the workman Kishan Chand was shown to be appointed in para 18 as fitter (general) in the scale of Rs. 85-3-115/-. In para 14 of service particulars at page 3 it is also mentioned that this workman was at Bhakra from 1958 to June 1967 and regarding the age of this workman it is entered that the date of birth was 1-1-1935 as per Bhakra Dam discharge certificates. A reference to para 16 of page 3 would show. The said certificate is the same which I have already referred as Ex. M/2 which gives the category of the workman as fitter (general) while he was working with Beas Dam Project. In the face of all these facts it is difficult to accept the contention of the Management that they had rightly terminated the services of this workman by way of retrenchment at his turn. Incidentally it may be mentioned that a copy of the discharge certificate is also pasted at page 4 of the service book Ex. M/3. The accumulative effect of my discussion is that the workman has established beyond all reasonable doubt that the termination of his services by way of retrenchment w.e.f. 20-8-77 was unjustified and uncalled for and accordingly he will be deemed to be in the service of the Management without any break and would be entitled to the arrears of his wages upto date as there is nothing to suggest that this workman was gainfully employed during this period. It may be mentioned that it would be open to the Management to deduct the retrenchment compensation out of these arrears of wages. This issue is decided accordingly..

9. ISSUE No. 1 :

In view of my findings upon issue no. 2 I hold that there is no question of estoppel against law. The termination of services of this workman was in violation of mandatory provisions of law and as such this issue is decided against the Management and in favour of the workman.

In view of my discussions above, it is awarded that the order of retrenchment of workman Kishan Chand w.e.f. 20-8-1977 by the Management was illegal and unjustified and that the workman is deemed to have continued in service of BSL till date without any break. He would be entitled to his arrears of wages minus the retrenchment compensation paid to him as ex-gratia. He would also be entitled to costs of this litigation which is assessed at Rs. 250.

Dated the 26th Sept. 1981

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

Further ordered :

That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Dated the 26th September, 1981

4th Asvina, 1903.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-42012 (1)/79-D. II. B]

S. S. BHALLA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 26th November, 1981

S.O. 3380.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-11-1981.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL :
CALCUTTA.**

Present :

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice R. Bhattacharya, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 56 of 1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited.

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers.—Mr. N. Das, Advocate, with Mr. D. Gangopadhyay, Sr. Personnel Officer.

On behalf of Workman.—Mr. Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine

AWARD

The present reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act has been sent to this Tribunal by the Government of India by its Order No. L-19012(60)/79-D-IV B dated 9th July, 1980 for adjudication of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sripur Colliery of Eastern Coalfields Limited, P. O. Kalipahari, District Burdwan, hereinafter referred to as the "Colliery" and their workman represented by the General Secretary, Ningha Colliery Mazdoor Union, G. T. Road (East), P. O. Asansol (Burdwan), hereinafter referred to as the "Union". The dispute has been mentioned in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of Sripur Colliery, P. O. Kalipahari, District Burdwan, in not designating Shri Chotey Lal Pandit, Munshi Incharge in Grade II with effect from 1st January, 1979 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The parties appeared before this Tribunal on receipt of notice of reference and filed their respective written statement. In short, the case of the Union appearing in the Grade II but confirmatory letter dated 9-12-78 of the written statement is that in the job allotment or distribution of work it was shown that Sri Chotey Lal Pandit and Bhaskar Patra had all along been performing the job of Munshi in-charge or supervisor. In the meantime, however, the management regularised Bhaskar Patra and placed in him

Grade II by a confirmatory letter dated 9-12-78 of the colliery. As Chotey Lal Pandit was not upgraded by the management an appeal was preferred but he got no relief. The Union took up the case of Chotey Lal for proper gradation but there was no result. The matter was taken to the Labour Enforcement Officer, Asansol and in presence of the representative of the management and the Union some minutes were recorded wherein it was stated that Bhaskar and Chotey Lal were appointed in May, 1947 in the same grade and scale of pay. Bhaskar was regularised as Traffic Munshi in-charge and was placed in Clerical grade II with basic pay of Rs. 450 per month with effect from 1-1-79. On examination of the records it was found that Chotey Lal Pandit, Bhaskar Patra and Durgabox were designated for the job of supervisor in first, second and third shift respectively. Chotey Lal and Bhaskar drew the same salary till the date when Patra was upgraded as in-charge. Although Bhaskar was designated Munshi in-charge yet Chotey Lal has not been designated as such. The Manager stated that Chotey Lal's name would be sent to the General Manager for regularisation and upgradation as Munshi in-charge. The grievance of the Union was that Chotey Lal though recommended by the colliery Manager to be upgraded as Munshi in-charge yet the Sub-Area Manager did not accept the proposal. The claim of the Union is that Chotey Lal should be designated as Munshi in-charge in grade II as has been done in the case of Bhaskar Patra.

3. The colliery's case, on the other hand, is that the present dispute is not an industrial dispute and that the question of designation cannot be a subject matter of dispute. It is stated that those who were working as Munshi in the colliery were described as pit clerk. Pit Munshi is the prevalent name. It was decided by the colliery to upgrade some Munshis from clerical grade III to clerical grade II. Bhaskar Patra who had been working as Munshi was promoted to Pit Munshi-in-charge in clerical grade II and there is no reason to challenge this promotion by any other workman.

4. The parties examined one witness each and several documents have been marked exhibits.

5. Mr. Sunil Mazumdar, General Secretary of the Union appearing on behalf of the workman submits at the time of hearing that in the present case Bhaskar Patra and Chotey Lal Pandit were employed in the same month of the year 1947 and that the management was wrong and acted illegally in upgrading Bhaskar Patra by designating him Munshi-in-charge, grade II. His grievance is that Chotey Lal Pandit also should have been designated as Munshi-in-charge in grade II. Mr. Das, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the colliery has submitted on the other hand that previously the concerned workmen Chotey Lal Pandit, Bhaskar Patra and others were designated as Munshi and subsequently they were graded as clerical grade III. Bhaskar was, however, upgraded to clerical grade II and was vested with supervisory power with the designation "Traffic Munshi-in-charge", clerical grade II. It is also submitted by Mr. Das that after the upgradation of Bhaskar, Chotey Lal and some others were also upgraded to clerical grade II and after the promotion of these persons to clerical grade II they are getting the same pay. The contention of Mr. Das is that Bhaskar Patra was senior in grade II and he was found fit to act as supervisor and was designated as "Traffic Munshi-in-charge" of grade II. In spite of such designation and supervisory power Bhaskar is not getting any special allowance or special pay for such designation or supervisory duty. According to Mr. Das Chotey Lal Pandit can have no grievance in this case.

6. On the side of the management of the colliery, the Manager has been examined as MW-1. He has been working as Manager in the Sripur Colliery from June, 1979. From him we get that Chotey Lal, Bhaskar Patra and some other persons were previously designated as Munshis but at present they have been designated as pit clerk, clerical grade II. Bhaskar has been working as Head Munshi correctly designated as "Traffic Munshi-in-charge" clerical grade II. From this witness we get that Durgabox, Chotey Lal and Bhaskar were promoted to clerical grade II and subsequently Bhaskar Patra has been given the supervising power and has been designated as Traffic Munshi-in-charge, clerical grade II. They are getting the same scale of pay and for supervision of the shifts Bhaskar is not getting anything in addition to his pay. MW-1 has further stated that Chotey Lal is not doing any work of supervision, neither has he been designated "Munshi-in-charge" of grade II. Bhaskar's official designation though in clerical grade II is traffic Munshi-in-charge, that is to say, he is to supervise the work of Pit Munshis. Ordinarily he is called Head Munshi.

7. As against the evidence of MW-1 the concerned workman Chotey Lal has been examined on the side of the Union and he has stated at first that he works as underground Munshi. Then he says that at present he is working as Munshi-in-charge and his evidence is that he applied for appointment of Munshi-in-charge and that was granted. The order for such appointment according to the witness is laying with the Union but no such order has been filed in the present case. He has admitted that Bhaskar looks after the work of Traffic Munshi but he does not admit that he looks after the works of three shifts. During cross-examination he has stated that he does not prepare make-up wages form but Bhaskar does it. He has also admitted that leave recommendations of the Pit Munshis are made by Bhaskar. He has also admitted that the official record Ext. M-8, attendance register is checked and signed by Bhaskar. He has stated that whenever Bhaskar is absent he does the work of Bhaskar. Ultimately, he has admitted during cross-examination that Bhaskar, Durgabox and he himself applied for the appointment of Munshi-in-charge but the management appointed Bhaskar as Munshi-in-charge and that he was not appointed as such.

8. Several documents of the colliery have been filed and marked exhibits. In the records of the Colliery Bhaskar appears to be Head Munshi or Munshi-in-charge showing that he supervises the work of the Pit Munshis. The attendance register also is signed by Bhaskar and not by Chotey Lal. In the B form register, marked Ext. M-5 Bhaskar Patra has been noted as regularised as Traffic Munshi-in-charge in clerical grade II with effect from 1-1-79 whereas Chotey Lal has not been described as such. The wagesheets for March, 1979 have been collectively marked as Ext. M-3. Here Bhaskar has been described as underground Traffic Munshi-in-charge and has been recorded as belonging to grade II. Paysheets for November, 1980 have been collectively marked Ext. M-9. Bhaskar has been described here as Traffic Munshi-in-charge. Chotey Lal has been described as Pit clerk, clerical grade II.

9. Considering the evidence of the Manager, the most competent witness in this case supported by documentary evidence exhibited in this case including Ext. M-4, letter of appointment of Bhaskar Patra as Traffic Munshi-in-charge there can be no doubt that Chotey Lal and Bhaskar Patra were elevated to Pit Munshi, clerical grade II on the same scale of pay but the management considered Bhaskar quite suitable and efficient person to act as Traffic Munshi-in-charge, clerical grade II, with effect from 1-1-79 and since then he has been working as such. The evidence further shows that Chotey Lal applied to get the designation of Munshi-in-charge but that was refused by the management. There is no evidence before me that such refusal was unreasonable, illegal or malafide.

10. In the facts and circumstances of this case I find no reason or evidence whatsoever to hold the action of the management of Sripur Colliery in not designating Shri Chotey Lal Pandit Munshi-in-charge, clerical grade II unjustified. The concerned workman can get no relief whatsoever in this case and he cannot claim any designation as Munshi-in-charge or Traffic Munshi-in-charge in clerical grade II.

I pass an award accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 13th November, 1981.

R. BHATTACHARYA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(60)/79-D.IV(B)]

SO 3381.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kajora Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 24-11-81.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
AT CALCUTTA

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice R. Bhattacharya, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer

Reference No. 45 of 1980

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kajora Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited,

AND

Their Workman.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. N. Das, Advocate, with Mr. M. L. Mall, Deputy Personnel Manager.

On behalf of Workman.—Mr. B. R. Neogi, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal Mine

AWARD

The instant reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has been sent to this Tribunal by the Central Government by its Order No. 19012(12)80[D.IV(B)] dated 18-6-1980 for adjudication of an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kajora Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited, P.O. Kajoragram (Burdwan), hereinafter referred to the "Colliery" and their workman represented by the Koyala Mazdoor Congress Chanshyam Colliery, P.O. Raniganj (Burdwan), hereinafter referred to as the "Union". The subject matter of the dispute has been mentioned in the schedule to the reference in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of Lachipur Colliery under Kajora Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited in refusing employment to Shri B. K. Pandey, Loading Supervisor with effect from 1st January, 1973 is justified. If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

2. The parties appeared in this case and filed their respective written statements. A rejoinder to the written statement of the Union has also been filed by the Colliery. The case appearing in the written statement of the Union shortly stated is that one B. K. Pandey was a bonafide employee of Lachipur colliery owned by Bengal Coal Company. He became an employee of the said colliery in the year 1968 as a Loading Supervisor and he drew Rs. 450 per month in or about 1973. There was no break in his service. On 31-1-73 coal mines were taken over by the Government of India according to law. Some of the employees of the colliery were not provided with any work or employment from 1st of February, 1973. The colliery after the takeover did not give any employment to B. K. Pandey in spite of several demands without any reason. Its action on the part of the colliery was illegal, arbitrary and malafide. By a letter dated 11-10-74 the Assistant Chief Personnel Officer addressed to the Sub-Area Manager stating that the case of B. K. Pandey deserved consideration for any approved vacancy suitable to his experience and qualification and the said Chief Personnel Officer recommended the employment of B. K. Pandey as weighman clerk at Ondal but ultimately no such employment was provided for. The grievance in the written statement is that some other persons were employed as weighment clerk ignoring the claim of B. K. Pandey. The claim of the union is that B. K. Pandey should be reinstated in the employment of the colliery with all previous salaries and allowances.

3. The case of the colliery appearing in the written statement and the rejoinder is simple. It is stated that B. K. Pandey was never in the service of the colliery before the takeover or after, either as loading supervisor or otherwise. The onus is on B. K. Pandey to prove that he was employed in 1968 in the colliery by any appointment letter or by other evidence. B. K. Pandey was an employee of a coal merchant who used to purchase coal from erstwhile owners of Lachipur colliery and his duty was to check the quality of coal sold to that merchant at the time of loading into the wagons at the pit of the colliery for despatch. He was an employee of the said coal merchant and he had nothing to do with the colliery or its owners. The said concerned workman was not a member of the Coal Mines Provident Fund because he was not an employee. The Union sponsoring the case of B. K. Pandey knew that the concerned workman was not an employee and, therefore, an endeavour was made to get a fresh employment for the workman in a new vacancy and

any recommendation given for such new employment cannot prove that the concerned workman was previously in the service of the colliery. The conciliation regarding this dispute was taken up after long lapse of seven years and B form register was found misplaced and lost and could not be produced. In short, the colliery wants to say that B. K. Pandey was never at any point of time an employee of Lachipur Colliery before or after the takeover and as such he is not entitled to get any relief.

4. In this case the union examined the concerned workman B. K. Pandey while the colliery examined two witnesses, MWs 1 and 2. Some documents had been marked exhibits on both sides.

5. Mr. B. R. Neogi, the learned Advocate appeared at the time of hearing on behalf of the union. His contention is that in 1968 B. K. Pandey was employed by the colliery as loading supervisor. He had been working without any break till the time of takeover of the mine by the Central Government on 31st January, 1973. After this takeover B. K. Pandey was not given any work in the colliery and in spite of approach he was not allowed to work although he was an employee of the colliery all the time. According to Mr. Neogi this action on the part of the colliery was high handed, illegal and unjustified. For this purpose he referred to two letters dated 1-11-74 and 17-6-76, marked Exhibits W-1 and W-2 respectively along with evidence of the concerned workman himself. During argument Mr. Neogi sharply commented upon the non-production of B Form register maintained by the erstwhile owners of the colliery handed over to the Custodian after the takeover.

6. Mr. Das, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the colliery, on the other hand, contended that the B Form register could not be produced in spite of best endeavour as it was untraced and that the letters referred to by Mr. Neogi did not prove that the concerned workman was ever in the employ of the colliery, but on the other hand, it goes against the case of the Union. Mr. Das's argument is that the concerned workman was never an employee of the colliery either in 1968 or at any time thereafter and that he was an employee of a coal merchant, who used to purchase coal from the colliery. It was B. K. Pandey who being the employee of that purchaser of coal supervised the work of loading of coal on behalf of the purchaser and taking an opportunity of the takeover of the colliery by the Government tried to lay false claim. In this connection Mr. Das has referred to several documents of the erstwhile owners of the colliery along with the evidence of the witnesses examined on behalf of the colliery to show that B. K. Pandey was not in the employ of the colliery as alleged.

7. The concerned workman B. K. Pandey has been examined as WW-1. He has stated that in 1968 he was the supervisor for loading and labour of the colliery. He was employed in 1968. Two days before the takeover he went to Benaras and he came back after two days of the takeover. Then he approached the Manager of the colliery for joining his duties. The Manager asked him to wait. He waited for 214 days. The workman again approached the Manager and he told him to wait. In this way 314 months passed. He was called by the Chief Personnel Officer and he went to the Headquarter at Sanctoria. Pandey was told to come and was assured that he would get his job. Two years passed in vain. If really Pandey was an employee before takeover, this conduct on his part was not normal. He did not get any job and in 1975 he again went to the Chief Personnel Officer and that time he was told that there was a vacancy in Ondal Station Weigh Bridge and so he would be given a job. That Officer wrote a letter to Headquarter office for his job. He referred to Ext. W-2 and another letter. During cross-examination he has stated that in 1968 he did not get any appointment letter. He was simply asked to work and he started work. This is something unusual, unexpected and cannot be readily accepted. He says that his duty was to collect labourers and he used to supervise the work of loading. In the written statement it has been stated that he was loading supervisor but during evidence he has stated that he was the supervisor for loading and labourers and that he used to collect labourers. This recruitment of labourers or to collect labourers cannot be a part of supervision of loading. He has stated that in 1968 D. H. Saha who deposed on behalf of the Colliery was the Labour Officer. The witness has stated that he used to get wages by voucher and not by pay-sheet. He used to get his salary for labour supervision

and loading supervision and the wages were paid every week. Sometimes he used to get Rs. 100 per week and sometimes Rs. 120. His clear evidence is that there was no fixed pay per week. He did not get any dearness allowance. He has admitted that he was not a member of Provident Fund Scheme. Pandey has further stated that contractor's labourers and colliery labourers loaded the wagons and he used to supervise the work of contractor's labourers and colliery labourers. He is not aware of any L.D. Sikri, who purchased coal from the colliery. He denied the suggestion that he was an employee of L. D. Sikri. He has also stated that he used to supervise the loading of coal purchased by the purchasers but he was paid by the colliery. He asked the management to be regularised in the employment of the colliery. His evidence is that his name appeared in the B Form of the colliery. Regarding the offer of appointment he has stated that for want of money and for maintaining his family he was willing to accept the post of weigh bridge clerk. This witness read upto class VIII in Hindi standard and he does not know English.

8. As against the evidence of the concerned workman, MW-1 has been examined on the side of the colliery. He is Dhukhaharan Saha whom the concerned workman identified before the Tribunal as the Labour Officer of the colliery in 1968. MW-1 has stated that he worked in the colliery from 1964 to April, 1973 as Welfare Officer. He knew the concerned workman B. K. Pandey, L. D. Sikri & Co. was the selling agent and used to purchase coal from the colliery and sold it outside. The witness has stated that B. K. Pandey was their employee and not an employee of the colliery. Pandey was not the loading supervisor or labour supervisor of the colliery. From this witness we get that the employees of the colliery were paid their salaries on Bradma Printed sheets. He has produced Exts. M-2 and M-3, list of employees of the colliery with forwarding letters. From this witness we also get that there were three classes of employees, monthly rated, daily-rated and piece-rated. Monthly rated and daily rated employees were known as the time-rated. There was no weekly rated employees. He has proved several documents including the register for leave and register of attendance of all employees of the colliery. The witness has stated that the B Form register of Lachipur colliery which was maintained prior to the takeover went to the possession of the Custodian. So long as he was in the colliery upto April, 1973 the said register was not returned by the Custodian. He had occasion to see the B Form register and he has asserted that in that register there was no name of B. K. Pandey. He has been cross-examined at length. During cross-examination he has stated that he knew all the employees of the colliery, some by name and some by face. Two representatives on behalf of L. D. Sikri & Company worked in the colliery. They were B. K. Pandey and one Nagen Sinha. The witness has stated that the colliery allotted quarters for the representatives of L. D. Sikri and B. K. Pandey lived in one of them. Time-rated workers namely daily-rated and monthly rated, had fixed rate of payment. Monthly rated employees used to get their payment at the end of the month. Daily rated employees used to be paid at the end of a week at first but subsequently the daily rated workers were paid at the end of the month. This change of mode of payment was made while he was in the colliery. The positive evidence of this witness is that after the takeover the Custodian took the B Form register maintained by the erstwhile owners of the colliery from him but so long as he was there till April, 1974 it was not returned by the Custodian. In the absence of B Form the old employees of the colliery could be regularised as there were wagesheets and other papers and on perusal of those papers there was no difficulty. As Welfare Officer he had to look into the wagesheets in case of disputes.

9. The next witness of the colliery is M. L. Mall. He is the Deputy Personnel Manager of Kajora Area in which Lachipur colliery is situated. He came here in November, 1980. He took charge of the present case in August 1981 and he tried to get hold of the relevant B form register meaning the register maintained by the erstwhile owners of the colliery. He searched at all possible places but he could not get it. The witness went to the office of the Custodian. He came in touch with the Administrative Officer but the said register could not be traced. At present, of course, the Custodian is not there and there is no Officer as Custodian. This witness came to know about the B Form register from MW-1 and therefore it is but natural that he went in search of the said register. From this witness we get that after the takeover new

Form register is being maintained at the Lachipur colliery and this register has been marked exhibit in this case.

10. I shall now discuss the documentary evidence in this case. In this case two important documents have been marked exhibits, they are Exts. M-2 and M-3. In Ext. M-2 we get forwarding letter with a list of employees of the Lachipur colliery. The forwarding letter is written to the Manager. In this letter we find that the list includes all time-rated employees of Lachipur colliery showing increments of their wages. It has also been stated that single normal increment is per grade and category has been sanctioned to all time-rated employees with effect from 1-12-72. Clearly the list of employees is an exhaustive list of the time-rated employees of Lachipur colliery. This letter is dated 18/20th December, 1972. Therefore, this list must have included all time-rated employees of Lachipur colliery as in December, 1972. This list does not include the name of B. K. Pandey indicating that B. K. Pandey was not a time-rated employee of Lachipur colliery in 1972. There is no challenge as to the genuineness of this document and I find no reason to doubt its genuine character. The next document is Ext. M-3. In this document we find a letter dated 24-7-69 written to the Manager, Lachipur colliery. In this exhibit we find a complete list showing personal duty in respect of time-rated employees of the colliery. There is also no challenge as to the genuineness of this document and in this list there is the absence of the name of B. K. Pandey. Clearly therefore, even in July 1969 B. K. Pandey was not a time-rated employee of Lachipur colliery. The present B Form register prepared and reconstituted after the take-over in not of much importance. Of course, the evidence of MW-1 is that there were papers after the takeover for which there was no difficulty with the management and it is no wonder that the present B Form register has been reconstituted as per papers found. Here is a register of leave application. I do not place its importance to it because an employee may not take leave at all and as such the name of such employee will not appear in the register. Of course in this register B. K. Pandey's name does not appear.

11. Mr. Neogi for the union has given much importance to exhibits W-1 and W-2 to show that B. K. Pandey must have been an employee of the colliery prior to takeover otherwise these two letters would not have been written. Ext. W-1 is a letter dated 1-11-74 from the Assistant Chief Personnel Officer, Sanctoria to the Assistant Chief Personnel Officer, Area IV. This exhibit is a copy of the letter sent to the Sub-Area Manager, Kairora Sub-area for sanction and doing as needed. In this letter it is indicated that there was some difficulty in respect of employment of B. K. Pandey as loading supervisor and regarding that letter it is stated that his case served consideration along with some others for any approved vacancy suitable to their qualifications and experience, and when such vacancy would arise in the area. This letter does not imply that there was any admission that B. K. Pandey was the loading supervisor in the colliery at any point of time. Rather, the letter suggests that there was some commendation for the employment of B. K. Pandey and at the case of B. K. Pandey and several others should be considered for their appointment in the vacancies in future according to their qualifications and experience. This letter clearly shows that the management had some sympathy and for that purpose they were willing to consider the case of B. K. Pandey and others for their future vacancies. There is no admission that B. K. Pandey was in the service of the colliery at any point of time.

12. Coming to Ext. W-2 I find that it is a letter dated 1-6-76 written by Assistant Chief Personnel Officer, Area V to the Assistant Chief Personnel Officer, Sanctoria. In this letter there is mention of difficulty for want of Weigh Bridge Clerk. It is also stated that sanction had already been conveyed to employ one B. K. Pandey of Lachipur colliery and is further stated that due to ban in post on fresh employment no recruitment could be made. Lastly it is requested that sanction may be renewed to employ B. K. Pandey to work as Weighment loaded wagons. Mr. Neogi for the Union has stated that because B. K. Pandey has been mentioned in "Lachipur colliery" it must be presumed that he was an employee of the colliery previously. This argument is unacceptable. The entire letter has got to be read along with

the facts and circumstances. In this case the evidence is that Pandey was working as Labour Supervisor of one L. D. Sikri & Co. and he was residing in the quarter allotted by the colliery for the men of purchasers of coal. The correspondence shows that sanction was given for appointment of B. K. Pandey as Weighment clerk but as there was ban for fresh recruitment he could not be taken in. The letter itself shows that he was given a new appointment. It was not intended to take him in as an old employee of the colliery but fresh employment might be given if vacancy would arise in a lower grade Ext. W-2 will therefore be of no avail to the union.

13. Coming to the merits of this case, I find that MW-1 Dukhcharan Saha is the best witness to speak about the state of affairs in the colliery from 1968 onwards. He was admittedly the Welfare Officer of the colliery from 1964 to 1973, that is to say, during the period prior to takeover he was there and he acted in the colliery even after the takeover. From him we get that the concerned workman B. K. Pandey was not an employee of the colliery. He was an employee of a Coal Purchaser, L. D. Sikri & Co. As Welfare Officer he had occasion to see the B form register of the erstwhile owners of the colliery and he asserts that B. K. Pandey was not an employee of the colliery. From this witness we get that after the takeover the Custodian took possession of the B form register of the previous owner. The witness has further stated that the said B form was not returned by the Custodian even until April 1973 so long as he was there. The evidence of MW-2 who is the Deputy Personnel Manager of the Area says that he took charge of this case in August, 1981 and he tried to get hold of the relevant B form register. He searched at all possible places. He went to the office of the Custodian but the said register could not be traced. From his evidence we also gather that at present a B form register has been prepared after the takeover. From the evidence I am satisfied that that Register has been reconstituted on the basis of certain papers of the previous owners of the colliery. In this connection two exhibits are very important and reliable. They are exhibits M-2 and M-3. M-2 which I have already mentioned is no doubt reliable and acceptable. I find nothing to challenge the genuineness of the said documents and Ext. M-3 is likewise dependable and genuine. They do not mention the name of B. K. Pandey although all other employees have been mentioned there. I very much rely upon the evidence of MWs 1 and 2 and also the exhibits M-2 and M-3. In this connection I may say that in the written statement the case of the workman was that B. K. Pandey was drawing a sum of Rs. 450 per month in or about 1973. The concerned workman MW-1 says that he got wages per week; sometimes he used to get Rs. 100 and sometimes Rs. 120 per week. He has stated also that there was no fixed pay per week. Now, this case of drawing salary per week is contrary to the case of monthly remuneration of Rs. 450 as mentioned in the written statement. In the written statement there is a fixed pay of Rs. 450 whereas in the evidence the case is otherwise. He has also stated that he was not a member of the Provident Fund Scheme. During cross-examination he has stated that he used to supervise the works of loading of coals purchased by the purchasers. MW-1 has stated that B. K. Pandey was a man of the purchasers of coal and was their employee. In this case I do hold that the colliery has deliberately withheld the B form register maintained by the previous owners. I am satisfied that such register is misplaced and untraced and could not be produced; no presumption can be drawn for non-production of the said document against the colliery. Giving my best consideration to the evidence on record and the facts and circumstances I have no doubt that B. K. Pandey was never in the employ of the colliery either before the takeover or thereafter. Pandey has stated during cross-examination that labourers of the contracts were made direct employees of the colliery after takeover. It is no wonder that B. K. Pandey took a chance to get the employment of the colliery after takeover on the false representation that he was an employee of the previous owner. I thoroughly reject the case of the Union. I hold that B. K. Pandey was not in the employment of the colliery at any point of time and that there was no question of refusing employment to him by the colliery. B. K. Pandey is not entitled to get any relief in this case.

14. Before I part with this case, I shall mention one fact. The evidence shows that the colliery had some sympathy for B. K. Pandey and consequently there was a sanction for his appointment as Weigh Bridge Clerk at Ondal. Of course this was a new appointment. During these hard days if the

colliery finds it convenient to give him some appointment according to his qualification, I think B. K. Pandey may be thankful, if not grateful.

I pass an award accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 17th November, 1981.

R. BHATTACHARYA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012(12)/80-D.IV.B]

S. S. MEHTA, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 27 नवम्बर 1981

का० आ० 3382—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1122 दिनांक 17 मार्च, 1981 के अन्तर्गत में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, हिन्दुस्तान एरोनाटिक्स लिमिटेड (सखनऊ विभाग) सखनऊ को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से अन्तर्वर, 1979 के प्रथम दिन से मई, 1980 के तेईसवें दिन तक जिनमें यह दिन भी सम्मिलित है, की अवधि के लिए छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अर्थात् :—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की बाबत जिनके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियाँ, ऐसे प्रारूप में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी ;

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

- (1) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरणी की विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ ; या
- (2) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख, उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गये थे या नहीं ; या
- (3) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रति कनसर्वेशन इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं ; या
- (4) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं ;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये सशक्त होगा :—

- (क) प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझता है ; या
- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक के अधिसूचनाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजूरी के संवाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा

करने दें, या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझें ; या

- (ग) प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक को, उसके अधिकारी सेवक को, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की ओर ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे कि व्यक्ति की जिनके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना ; या
- (घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की न तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

व्याख्यात्मक भाष्य

इस मामले में पूर्वापेक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई क्योंकि छूट के लिए प्राप्त आवश्यकताओं की कार्यवाई पर समय लगता था यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वापेक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

[संख्या एस-38014/44/78-एच०आ
भार० के० दास, प्रवर स

New Delhi, the 27th November, 1981

S.O. 3382.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. S.O. 1122 dated the 17th March, 1981, the Government hereby exempts Hindustan Aeronautics Limited (Lucknow Division), Lucknow from the operation of said Act for a further period with effect from the 1st October, 1979 upto and inclusive of the 23rd May, 1980.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 ;

(2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other officer of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes, of—

- (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act for the period ; or
- (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period ; or
- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue entitled to benefits provided by the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under notification ; or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the said period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory ;

be empowered to—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may require ; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in-charge thereof to produce to

Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or

(c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee ; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

[No. S-38014/44/78-HI]

R. K. DAS, Under Secy.

आवेदना

नई दिल्ली, 28 नवम्बर, 1981

क्र० प्र० 3383.—भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्र० 1780 तारीख 19 जून, 1963 द्वारा गठित श्रम न्यायालय के पीठासीन अधिकारी के कार्यालय में, जिसका मुख्यालय जयपुर में है, एक पत्र रिक्त हुआ है ;

अतः, अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री सत्य नारायण शाह को उक्त श्रम न्यायालय के पीठासीन अधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ।

[सं० एल-11020/3/81-डी० 1(ए०)]

के० के० हांडा, धरर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th November, 1981

S.O. 3383.—Whereas a vacancy has occurred in the office of the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court with headquarters at Jaipur constituted by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1780 dated the 19th June, 1963 ;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Satya Narain Shah, as the Presiding Officer of the Labour Court constituted as aforesaid.

[No. S-11020/3/81-D.I.A.]

K. K. HANDA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 1st December, 1981

S.O. 3384.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21st November, 1981.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL :

CALCUTTA

MR. JUSTICE R. BHATTACHARYA, M.A., B.L., PRESIDING OFFICER

Reference No. 14 of 1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta.

And

Their Workmen

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers.—Mr. D. K. Mukherjee, Labour Officer.

On behalf of Workmen.—Mr. A. B. Pain, Member of the Executive Committee of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Port

AWARD

This reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 arises out of the Order No. L-32012(10)/78-D.IV (A) dated 6th March, 1979 issued by the Government of India for adjudication of an industrial dispute between the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta, hereinafter referred to as the "Port Trust" and their workmen represented by the National Union of Waterfront Workers, 15, Coal Dock Road, Calcutta, hereinafter referred to as the "Union". The subject matter of the dispute has been mentioned in the schedule to the reference in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta in confirming Shri Barendra Nath Mondal as Lascar with effect from 1st February, 1971 and depriving him of the seniority and promotion on M.L. "Dasarath" is justified ? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?"

2. The parties appeared in this case and filed their respective written statements and rejoinders. The case of the workmen appearing in the written statement filed by the Union is that the concerned workman Barendra Nath Mondal was appointed as a lascar on the Despatch Vessel "Seva" of the Port Trust on 8-2-64 against the permanent and substantive post which fell vacant due to the resignation of Abdul Barick. Thereafter Barendra was transferred to the Launch "Dasarath" on 1-1-68. According to the Union as per practice and rules of the Port Trust an employee appointed against a permanent vacancy is made permanent by confirmation after a continuous service of six months and on that basis Barendra should have been confirmed in the post of lascar on "Seva" on 8-8-64, on the completion of six months continuous service. Barendra was not confirmed on 8-8-64. It is alleged that there was inordinate delay in confirming Barendra in the post of lascar with a mala-fide intention to deprive him of his seniority and as a result thereof his junior became senior to him. It is stated that Barendra should have been confirmed against the vacancy of Abdul Barick in item No. 26 of Muster Roll and it is stated in the written statement that it is surprising that Barendra Nath Mondal was put in item No. 25 which was being held by Madhusudan Barua, a permanent incumbent. On 1-1-65 along with Barendra's Mondal, one Shanti Ranjan Mahattam who was appointed as a lascar of the Despatch Vessel 'Nadia' was also transferred. The grievance in the written statement is that though Mahattam was appointed as lascar against a permanent vacancy after Barendra yet the said Shanti Ranjan Mahattam was confirmed on 1-3-65 earlier than the date of confirmation of Barendra. According to the Union the action of the management in confirming Barendra with effect from 1-2-71 after long delay was unjust, unfair, illegal and irregular. Considering the confirmation of Shanti Ranjan Mahattam the confirmation of Barendra was discriminatory and mala-fide. The dispute was raised before the Conciliation Officer but as there was no settlement the dispute has ultimately been sent to this Tribunal for decision. The main prayer of the Union in this case is that Barendra Nath Mondal should be declared confirmed to the post of lascar on 8-8-64 giving the benefit of seniority over Shanti Ranjan Mahattam and that consequential benefits be given to Barendra.

3. The Port Trust submitted its written statement challenging the relevant allegations made by the Union in its written statement. To be short, the case of the Port Trust is that the River Dredgers and Despatch Vessels and attached launches are under the Superintendent, Dredger and Despatch Service. At the time of appointment of Barendra Nath Mondal there were two despatch vessels, D. V. Seva and D. V. Nadia. Subsequently in 1968 another vessel M. L. Dasarath was put into commission. Barendra Nath Mondal was appointed as temporary lascar on D. V. Seva on 8-2-64

against a vacancy following a temporary promotion of one Madhusudan Barua in item No. 26 of the Muster roll to the post of Seacunny in the same vessel. Barendra worked in Seva as lascar upto 3-1-68 and during this period he could not be confirmed in the post of lascar in Seva as Madhusudan was still enjoying the officiating promotion having a lien to the post of lascar. Madhusudan Barua was ultimately confirmed in the post of Seacunny on 4-8-71. In the meantime on commission of a new vessel M. L. Dasarath, Barendra was transferred to the said vessel with effect from 4-1-68 as lascar along with other lascars including Shanti Ranjan of "Nadia". At the time of commission of Dasarath temporary posts of crew were created on year to year basis for manning the vessel and ultimately the temporary posts were retained as permanent posts by the Port Trust with effect from 4-1-71. After this according to the position of seniority Barendra was confirmed as lascar with effect from 1-2-71 in M. L. Dasarath. According to the decision of the Tribunal in Reference No. 1 of 1956 each vessel and consequently Seva is considered as a separate unit for the purpose of confirmation, promotion, etc. M.L. Dasarath in view of this decision became a separate unit for the purpose of confirmation, promotion, etc. The seniority of the employees of the Port Trust is determined on the basis of their date of confirmation. Barendra Nath Mondal was duly confirmed and he was never superseded by anybody either in Seva or in Dasarath. The submission of the Port Trust is that the confirmation of Barendra Nath Mondal as lascar from 1-2-71 was justified, legal and Barendra was never deprived of his seniority of promotion on M. L. Dasarath. The allegations of unfairness, illegality and malafides have been denied.

4. At the hearing Mr. D. K. Mukherjee, Labour Officer of the Port Trust appeared on behalf of the management and Mr. A. B. Pain, an Executive Committee member of the Union duly authorised appeared on behalf of the workmen. Several documents have been exhibited in this case. The concerned workman Barendra Nath Mondal has been examined as WW-1 and on the side of the Port Trust, one Arijit Kumar Mukherjee, Assistant Lighting Officer was examined as MW-1.

5. The submission of Mr. Pain on behalf of the Union is that the concerned workman was given the temporary appointment against a permanent vacancy of one Abdul Barick in Seva and, therefore, according to the circular of the Port Trust he should have been confirmed with the expiry of six months from such appointment. It has been further argued that one Shanti Ranjan Mahattam who was temporarily appointed after the appointment of Barendra was confirmed in the permanent post of lascar long before the confirmation of Barendra in 1971. Mr. Pain's grievance is that the confirmation of Barendra in 1971 was illegal, unjust and not a bona fide one. The contention of Mr. Mukherjee on behalf of the Port Trust, on the other hand, is that Barendra was appointed against a vacancy of one Madhusudan Baruah who was given promotion as officiating seacunny and, therefore, the vacancy in which Barendra was taken was not permanent or clear. It was encumbered and, therefore, Barendra could not be confirmed until Madhusudan was confirmed in the post seacunny. It has also been argued that Barendra was not recruited in the vacancy of any Abdul Barick as alleged. Further submission of Mr. Mukherjee is that the circular referred to by Mr. Pain was not applicable to the case of Barendra who was not given appointment against any permanent or clear vacancy.

6. Let us now consider whether as alleged by the Union Barendra Nath Mondal was appointed in place of any Abdul Barick alleged to have left service making his post of lascar vacant. First of all I shall consider the evidence of the concerned workman himself. He stated that on 8-2-64 he was appointed a lascar in the vessel "Seva" on temporary basis. He has stated that when Pakisthanis left there was a vacancy and in that vacancy he was appointed. During examination in-chief he has stated that he does not know who was the incumbent occupying the post which fell vacant and against which he was appointed. Certain other facts have been admitted by Barendra in his evidence. From him we get Shanti Ranjan was appointed in vessel "Nadia" against permanent and substantive vacancy. The Port Commissioners had only one Muster Roll. He has admitted the Muster roll produced by the Port Trust, marked Ext. M-5. Of course he has stated that he saw ano-

ther Muster roll in which his attendance was registered but that is not Ext. M-5. He has admitted further that in Ext. M-5 there is the correct calculation of his wages in March, 1964.

7. On the side of the Port Trust the Lighting Officer Ajit Kumar Mukherjee has been examined as MW-1. From him we get that Barendra was appointed as a temporary lascar on 8-2-64 in place of Madhusudan Baruah who got promotion as officiating seacunny. He produced the Muster Roll Ext. M-5. This is known as Check Register-cum-Muster roll. He has stated that there was no Abdul Barick in Seva upto February 1964 but there was one Abdul Bari upto January, 1964 and that Abdul Bari must have left the service. From him we also get that upto 3-1-68 Barendra worked in Seva and thereafter on 4-1-68 he was transferred to M. L. Dasarath which was commissioned in that year. When it was commissioned Barendra was transferred there as temporary lascar. From this witness we also get that on 4-8-71 Madhusudan was confirmed in the post of seacunny in Seva and Barendra was confirmed as a lascar on 1-2-71 when the post of lascar in Dasarath which was originally temporary was made permanent. The witness has further stated that Madhusudan Baruah was mentioned in Sl. No. 26 of the Muster Roll and when Barendra was appointed after the promotion of Madhusudan as officiating seacunny, Barendra's name appeared as Sl. No. 26A. The practice is that whenever any person is appointed against the vacancy of another the name of the person appointed is posted below the name in whose place he is appointed. MW-1 has stated that no person appointed after Barendra in Seva was confirmed before Barendra. The seniority of employees of each vessel is maintained separately and unit-wise/vessel-wise. Three lascars were transferred to Dasarath. They were Sk. Khaleque and Barendra from Seva and Shanti Ranjan Mahattam from vessel Nadia and all these three persons joined in Dasarath on the same day. Shanti Ranjan was appointed in Nadia on 10-5-64 and he was confirmed in Nadia on 1st of March, 1965. Shanti Ranjan was appointed against a vacant unencumbered post. The witness has asserted that the seniority of these lascars were made according to the dates of their confirmation. From this witness we get that one Madhusudan Raha and not Madhusudan Barua was taken temporarily in place of Abdul Bari on 6-2-64 on Seva as lascar.

8. I will now focus my attention to the relevant documentary evidence. Ext. M-1 is the service register of Barendra Mondal. We get in this document that the date of appointment of Barendra as temporary lascar in Seva was 8-2-64. He was transferred from Seva to Dasarath on 4-1-68. He was confirmed as lascar with effect from 1-2-71 on the basis of a letter dated 8-12-73. The service register of Madhusudan Baruah has been marked Ext. M-8. It shows that madhusudan Baruah was appointed as temporary lascar on 10-12-54 and was confirmed in that office on 1-8-63. From the service register we also get that Madhusudan Baruah went on leave from 28-1-64 to 17-2-64 and from 18-2-64 he joined as acting seacunny on officiating promotion. We further get from this register that ultimately Madhusudan Baruah was confirmed as seacunny from 4-8-71. I have scrutinised Ext. M-5, the Muster roll and I find that there was no Abdul Barick there as lascar. On the other hand in the Muster roll we find that in Sl. No. 26 for the month of February, 1964 the name of Madhusudan Baruah appeared and under his name the name of Barendra Nath Mondal has been mentioned as 26A. There is no dispute that Barendra was appointed as temporary lascar on 8-2-64. The evidence is that Madhusudan went on leave from 28-1-64 and thereafter joined as officiating seacunny on 18-2-64. Clearly, therefore, I have no hesitation to hold that Barendra Nath Mondal was appointed in the post of lascar in Seva when Madhusudan Baruah was on leave and thereafter started acting as officiating seacunny. Barendra was not appointed against any vacancy of any Abdul Barick as alleged. I find in Ext. M-5 the Muster roll for February 1964 that one Abdul Bari's name appeared in Sl. No. 16 and under his name appeared the name of Madhusudan Raha with Sl. No. 16 A. Consequently Madhusudan must have been appointed as lascar in place of Abdul Bari. The service register of Madhusudan Raha has been marked Ext. M-9. The service sheet shows that he started working in Seva as lascar on 6-2-64. Therefore Madhusudan Raha was taken in place of Abdul Bari on 6-2-64 two days before the appointment of Barendra Nath Mondal. Considering the facts and circumstances I have no doubt to hold that Barendra Nath Mondal was appointed a temporary lascar

in the vacancy of Madhusudan Baruah who was promoted as officiating seacunny. His post as lascar was not permanently vacant or unencumbered. Madhusudan has certainly lien in his permanent post of lascar so long as he was not confirmed. Therefore, Barendra was not appointed against any permanent vacancy and he could not have been confirmed as lascar unless Madhusudan Baruah was confirmed in the post of seacunny.

9. Coming to the circular or rule on which Mr. Pain relied for confirmation of Barendra with the expiry of six months from the date of his appointment, it appears from Ext. M-4, a letter of the Secretary dated 2nd July, 1947 that every employee appointed in a temporary capacity against a substantive vacancy should ordinarily be confirmed after six months service and in any case after the lapse of one year. On the basis of this letter Mr. Pain's argument is that when Barendra was appointed on 8-2-64 he ought to have been confirmed on 8-8-64. This argument is of no avail because it is clearly stated that this letter relates to the appointment against a substantive vacancy but in the encumbered vacancy of Madhusudan Baruah who was for the time being officiating in a higher post Barendra was appointed. Therefore when it was not a substantive vacancy this rule cannot be applied to the case of Barendra Nath Mondal.

10. We have before us evidence that on 4-1-68 the launch M. L. Dasarath was constituted and on that date Barendra a temporary lascar was transferred there along with two others, namely Sk. Khaleque and Shanti Ranjan Mahattam. Barendra and Sk. Khaleque were of Seva and Shanti Ranjan was of vessel Nadia. The evidence is that Shanti Ranjan was appointed as temporary lascar against a permanent vacancy on 10-5-64. His service register has been marked as Ext. M-3. We get in evidence that he was confirmed on 1-3-65. I find no evidence to challenge this confirmation. It further shows that on 4-1-68 he was transferred to Dasarath. When he was transferred to Dasarath he was already a confirmed lascar. Sk. Khaleque was admittedly a confirmed lascar of Seva and he was confirmed with effect from 7-8-64 according to an award of this Tribunal passed in Reference No. 14 of 1975. According to the evidence initially the post of lascar in Dasarath was temporary but it was made permanent with effect from 1-2-71. The evidence further is that Barendra was confirmed and made permanent on that very date. There is no claim before me that Barendra should have been senior to Khaleque. The evidence, as I have already stated, is that Shanti Ranjan was legally confirmed in 1965, although he was appointed after the date when Barendra was given temporary appointment as lascar. There is no dispute before me and admittedly Madhusudan Baruah was confirmed in the post of seacunny on 4-8-71 as evidenced by his service register, Ext. M-8 and, therefore, there could not have been any substantive vacancy of Madhusudan's post as lascar before 4-8-71. But, we find in the present case that the permanent posts of lascar were created in Dasarath on 1-2-71 and Barendra was confirmed on that very day and made permanent before 4-8-71 and this confirmation was very much reasonable and according to law. But as Shanti Ranjan was confirmed earlier in vessel Nadia according to Das Gupta award vessel-wise there could be no grievance from the side of Barendra regarding the seniority of Shanti Ranjan over him.

11. At the end of the argument Mr. Pain's grievance is that although Shanti Ranjan became confirmed before the confirmation of Barendra on the basis of his appointment vessel-wise, this principle does not appear to be reasonable and just. In the present case there is no dispute that Barendra was appointed as temporary lascar before the temporary appointment of Shanti Ranjan as such. It also appears that Shanti Ranjan was confirmed in his post long before the confirmation of Barendra. This was due to the principle adopted by the Port Trust in the matter of confirmation vessel-wise. The lascars of different vessels are appointed under the Port Trust and they are controlled by the same department. According to Mr. Pain Barendra should have been confirmed in the substantive post of lascar where Shanti Ranjan was finally confirmed. Mr. Pain wants to say that when the lascars are controlled by the same department and employed under the same authority they should have been confirmed according to the date of appointment whenever there is availability of substantive vacancy. Mr. Pain's view is that the practice of confirmation vessel-wise has caused injustice and this may create disappointment and dissatisfaction amongst the employees. However, so long the award of Das Gupta is there

and so long the rule of the Port Trust is not changed respect of confirmation, the position will be the same. I however a matter for workmen through Union or others and the employers to consider whether there should be change in this matter. In the present reference I have no jurisdiction to comment upon it.

12. However, as discussed above, according to my find I hold that the action of the management of Calcutta P Trust Calcutta in confirming Barendra Nath Mondal as las with effect from 1st February 1971 was legal and just and there was no question of depriving him of his senior or promotion on the vessel Dasarath or in any other man. The concerned workman Barendra Nath Mondal can no relief whatsoever.

I pass an award accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 12th November, 1981.

Sd]-

R. BHATTACHARYA, Presiding Officer
[No. L-32012(10)/78-D. IV]
NAND LAL, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 4th December, 1981

S.O. 3385.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Madras in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of T. Sevi Contractor, Ponkumar Magnesite Mines and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 17-11-81.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSANAM DANIEL, B.A., B.
Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Tamil Nadu
(Constituted by the Government of India)

Wednesday, the 4th day of November, 1981

Industrial Dispute No. 55 of 1978

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 betw Thiru Sevi, Contractor of Ponkumar Magnesite Mines and his workmen.)

BETWEEN

The General Secretary,
Salem District Magnesite Labour Union,
237, Tharamangalam Road, Suramangalam,
Salem-5.

AND

Thiru Sevi, Contractor,
Ponkumar Magnesite Mines,
Jaghir Ammapalayam,
Salem-5.

REFERENCE

Order No. L-29012/16/77-D.III/B, dated 15-9-1978 of Ministry of Labour, Government of India.

This dispute after having been remanded by the High Court in W.P. No. 841 of 1979, dated 17-6-1981, coming on this for final disposal in the presence of Thiru K. Chandru Thiruvalluvar Row and Reddy and K. Chandru, Advocate, the Union and the employer or his advocates Thiru T.N. Gururajan and S.R.V. Ramanan being absent and counsel for the workmen having made endorsement that dispute may be dismissed as not pressed as settled outside C this Tribunal made the following.

AWARD

This is an industrial dispute between Thiru Sevi, Contractor of Ponkumar Magnesite Mines, Salem and his workmen referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(

of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L. 29012/16/77-D.III/B, dated 15-9-1978 of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

Whether the action of Shri Sovi, Contractor of Ponkumar Magnesite Mines, Salem is justified in dismissing Sarvashri Mani, Ramaswamy and Venkatachalam with effect from the 7th January, 1977 ? If not to what relief are the aggrieved workmen entitled ?

(2) In this dispute, my learned predecessor Thiru K. Velvaratnam passed an Award on 24-1-1979 holding that there was no justification on the part of the Contractor in dismissing Thiruvalargal Mani, Ramaswami and Venkatachalam with effect from 7th January, 1977 and they are entitled to be reinstated with wages from 7-1-1977 and continuity of service. Thereafter, the employer filed an application for setting aside the award passed by my Predecessor and this application was rejected.

(3) Against the Award and order in Miscellaneous Application No. 22 of 1979 the Employer preferred Writ Petition in the High Court for quashing the award. The Writ Petition was disposed of by the High Court on 17-6-1981

(W.P. No. 841 of 1979) and set aside the Award and the matter remitted back to this Tribunal.

(4) On receipt of the High Court's Order, parties were issued notices for hearing on 1-8-1981. The employer was again absent and no representation was made.

(5) After several adjournments when the dispute was called today, the counsel for the workmen made endorsement on the claim statement that the dispute was settled with the employer outside the Court and that the worker is no longer interested in this dispute. Hence the Union is not pressing its claim made in this dispute and prays for the dismissal of the claim as not pressed.

(6) In view of the endorsement, award is passed dismissing the claim as not pressed.

(7) No costs.

Dated, this 4th day of November, 1981.

T. SUDARSANAN DANIEL, Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Tamil Nadu,

[No. L-28013/1/81-D.III.B]

SHASHI BHUSHAN, Under Secy.

